



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines


Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



The Palestinian version of the Holy Scriptures



S.R.B.

G.R.B.



ORIENTAL INSTITUTE
LIBRARY



OXFORD UNIVERSITY

744.74

Gw1.1



202472004

Anecdota Oxoniensia
THE
PALESTINIAN VERSION
OF THE
HOLY SCRIPTURES

Five more Fragments

RECENTLY ACQUIRED BY
THE BODLEIAN LIBRARY

EDITED
WITH INTRODUCTION AND ANNOTATIONS

BY
G. H. Gwilliam, B.D.
FELLOW OF HERTFORD COLLEGE



Oxford
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
1893

London

HENRY FROWDE
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE
AMEN CORNER, E.C.



New York

MACMILLAN & CO., 112 FOURTH AVENUE



28 JUL 1971


CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION :—	PAGES
Description of the fragments, §§ 1, 2. The handwriting, § 3. The probable date, § 4. The dialect, § 5. Plan of this edition, § 6. The relation of the version to the original in the O. T. fragment, § 7 (1); in the N. T. fragments, § 7 (2)	v-xiii
2 TIMOTHY I. 11-18 IN THE PESHITTO, THE HARCLEAN, AND THE PALESTINIAN	xiv
LIST OF ALL THE KNOWN REMAINS OF THE PALESTINIAN VERSION	xvi
THE GREEK READINGS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT FRAGMENTS .	xx
LIST OF PALESTINIAN AND OTHER WORDS AND FORMS . .	xxiv
NOTES ON THE SYRIAC TEXT OF THE FRAGMENTS . . .	xxvii
ADDITIONAL NOTES	xl
THE SYRIAC TEXT OF THE BODLEIAN FRAGMENTS WITH AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION	1-23

PLATE I, *Numbers* IV. 46, 47; 49—V. 2.

PLATE II, 1 *Thessalonians* IV. 10-15.

PLATE III, 2 *Timothy* I. 10-17.



[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

INTRODUCTION

1. Early in the year 1891, five parchment leaves were sent to the Bodleian Library from Egypt, where they had been procured by the late Rev. Greville J. Chester¹. The leaves are palimpsests, four being rewritten on both sides, the fifth on one side only. The upper writing is in an ancient cursive Hebrew hand, and is assigned by Dr. Neubauer to the beginning of the twelfth century of our era. It consists of certain portions of the Mishnah, and as these will be described in the Appendix to Dr. Neubauer's *Catalogue of Hebrew MSS. in the Bodleian Library*, a further account of them is unnecessary here. Three of the portions are shown in our collotypes.

The Hebrew of these fragments is, relatively, of little value, but the mode of its transmission is interesting; for, as I am informed by Dr. Neubauer, whose name is sufficient guarantee for the truth of the statement, it is very rare indeed to find portions of the Mishnah copied upon the writings of Christian scribes. On the other hand, the original contents of these palimpsests are interesting and valuable, both to the theologian and the grammarian. The leaf, which is half palimpsest, contains some verses from the Book of Numbers, and these certainly appear to belong to the version known as the *Palestinian Syriac Old Testament*, of which some fragments are preserved in the British Museum, and in the Imperial Library, St. Petersburg. The four New Testament leaves contain several verses from *Colossians*, 1 *Thessalonians*, 2 *Timothy*, and *Titus*, written in the same dialect² as

¹ *MS. Syr. c. 4 Bibl. Bodl.* Readers, who are unable to consult the originals, will find in our collotypes not only reproductions of parts of the text, but very good representations of the present appearance of the fragments.

² Called the *Christian* (or *Syrian*)—*Palestinian*; see *Traité de Grammaire Syriaque* (Duval), Introduction, pp. vii, viii, x.

the fragments just named, and the *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum* in the Vatican Library. They confirm the inference from the recently-discovered Sinaitic leaf¹, that the Pauline Epistles were also included in the Palestinian Version.

2. The collotypes, which we have prefixed, show the present sizes of the pages. The four New Testament leaves are $12 \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ inches. The small leaf has lost about five lines of the Syriac writing. It must have been originally about seven inches square; it is now $5\frac{3}{4} \times 7$. The handwriting of the four leaves is a very fine specimen of that particular script, and the acquisition of these fragments is a distinct gain to the palaeographer. They will occupy a place of their own amongst the treasures of the Bodleian Library; for, as we shall presently show, there is good reason for regarding these four leaves as some of the oldest extant specimens of the particular hand which they exhibit. The writing is certainly one of the most beautiful examples of the style with which we are acquainted, and bears evident indications of great antiquity, whatever may be the actual date of the Syriac MS. from which the leaves were at some time abstracted.

It will be seen that the four leaves are inscribed in double columns. Each column contains 22 lines. The letters are seldom cramped, and occasionally a word is a good deal extended to fill up the line². It is clear that these leaves, which are connected in subject, formed parts of one codex. The odd leaf belonged to another manuscript. It also has two columns, and, in its present state, shows 15 lines; perhaps originally there were five more³. The writing is smaller, and, in my opinion, later⁴; but it is well executed. This leaf was turned upside down by the Jewish scribe, so that the first line of his work is at the bottom of the page. The other leaves were turned half round, and some of the pages were written across from the top line of the Syriac, some from the bottom line. The photograph shows the palimpsest side of the odd leaf. This leaf is the most legible of the five, even

¹ See pp. xvi, xvii. It contains a few verses of *Galatians*.

² Examples in the collotypes are:—crowded lines, Plate II, col. 1, ll. 2, 6; extended words, col. 2, l. 14, Plate III, col. 2, ll. 12, 13.

³ How many lines there were, it is impossible to say, until we know whether the lacunae represent as much as the Hebrew contains, or whether there were longer, or shorter, readings.

⁴ But see p. 10, second paragraph.

on its palimpsest side. In the other four, while the upper hand has well retained its original blackness, the first hand, in some places, has almost faded away, in others has changed to a yellowish brown¹. The photograph, on the whole, has served to bring into greater clearness the under writing; but the loss of colour deprives the reader of an advantage, which the manuscript itself affords, for distinguishing between the hands where they cross. There are no indications of a second Syriac hand, unless the gloss on fol. 4 r has been added later; but I do not think that its hand can be unhesitatingly ascribed to another era. The letters are smaller; but so also are the characters of the Titles, Subscriptions, and Rubrics—see pp. 10 and 14.

3. The distinctive characteristics of the Palestinian script² occur in the fragments, and are shown in our collotypes. *Ph* and *P* are represented by two letters, ܦ and its inversion ܦ. The latter is especially used for the Greek π , as in the proper name ܡܠܥܝܢ, Paulus; but it also occurs for the Syriac ܦ *Kushaiatum* in such a form as ܡܠܥܝܢ, Collotype III, col. 1, l. 12. That form however is derived (*Thes. Syr.* 3114) from $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\alpha\iota$, although it is conjugated like a Syriac verb. On the same plate (l. 14) we have ܡܠܥܝܢ, although the first letter must be ܦ. On fol. 1 r a, l. 19, I was at first inclined to read ܡܠܥܝܢ, and am still doubtful, for the letters are very faint and obscure. Ἱερόπολις would require ܦ, but a dialectic softening into *ph* after *r* is conceivable. We may compare fol. 4 v b, l. 13, where $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\varsigma$ is expressed by ܡܠܥܝܢ. Again on Plate I, col. 2, l. 12, will be found ܡܠܥܝܢ : ܡܠܥܝܢ, where the second word ought to begin with ܦ = ܦ, and there is a stop between the *p* and the *r*. It may be thought that ܦ and ܦ have sometimes been confused through carelessness; but, as far as can be judged from these small portions, our MSS. were carefully transcribed, contrasting in this respect very favourably with Adler's *Evangeliarium*; so that perhaps the most reasonable supposition is, that the special character ܦ was only employed in cases where, as in ܡܠܥܝܢ, it was desirable to emphasize the hard sound of the *p*, or, as in ܡܠܥܝܢ (Ἀρχιππος), to indicate the doubling of the letter, or, as in ܡܠܥܝܢ, to

¹ Cf. Dr. Wright's remarks about Cod. Add. B. M. 14,450, fol. 14, in *Catalogue of the Syriac MSS. in the British Museum*, Part III, p. xxxii. note, and the page, Plate XVIII.

² Duval, *op. cit.* § 11.

show that the Greek name was spelt with Π and not Φ¹. The **ⲡⲁ** in the proper name, Plate III, col. 2, l. 12, is not a special character: the appendage belongs to the Hebrew².

D is always written **ⲁ**, without the point, but *R* is **ⲓ**. Other letters are occasionally provided with diacritical points, as **ⲕ̇**, Plate II, col. 2, l. 12, and the final letter of **ⲕⲓⲁⲟ**, Plate I, col. 2, l. 3. Probably *a pr. m.* points were much used to distinguish the forms, and (ⲙ̇) seems to have been regularly written upon the plurals; but in the present state of the pages these points are not always legible. There are only a few instances of the single stop (.), but an example of its use will be found on Plate III, col. 1, l. 4. On the other hand the double (:) is legible in several places, and appears to be of frequent occurrence; at 2 Tim. i. 18, it is used as a final stop. ⲑ and Ⲓ are used on fol. 1 v a, ll. 9, 10, as ornaments to the lines. The former is found at Titus ii. 3 and 8 as a subordinate stop. In the facsimile in *Miniscalchi Erizzo* the figures ⲑ and Ⲓ, in red, are frequent as stops: in one place there are four points, ⲑⲒ.

4. It is impossible to assign an exact date to these fragments, and difficult even to say to what century they belong. At present there are not materials available for dating Palestinian MSS., such as those which abound in the case of the works of the Edessene and Nestorian scribes³. We have however some indications of the history of the Palestinian hand. Our starting-point is Adler's Vatican Evangelium, which is dated 1030 A.D.⁴ Of undoubtedly later date are such debased hands as that of Add. 14,664, fol. 34 a, and possibly that of fol. 26 b⁵. And it is equally clear that the old writing on fol. 14 of Add. 14,450 is

¹ Dr. Land (*Anecdota Syriaca*, vol. iv. p. 214) writes of the London and St. Petersburg Palestinian fragments:—'Ex eo quod ⲁ literam omnes Palestini invertunt, qua Graecorum expriment, apparet, eam aspiratam fuisse praeter voces a Graecis sumptas et (in Psalmis certe Londinensibus) eas in quibus ⲁ olim producebatur seu duplicatur;' and gives as examples such Syriac forms as **ⲁⲩ**, **ⲁⲩⲓ**, **ⲁⲩⲓⲁ**, with inverted ⲁ.

² See the note on the place.

³ See *Studia Biblica*, III, p. 50, n. 2.



⁴ It was written in Antioch 'in the year 1341 of Alexander the Greek;' see colophon quoted in *Versiones Syriacae* (Adler), p. 139, and *Evangelium Hierosolymitanum* (Miniscalchi Erizzo), p. 576. Dr. Wright, *op. cit.* p. xxxii. note §, accepted the date, and I do not know that there is any reason for questioning the statement of the colophon.

⁵ See Plates XIX, XX, in Wright's Catalogue; also the interesting series of seven facsimiles annexed to Professor Land's *Anecdota Syriaca*, vol. iv.

older than that of Adler's MS. Of this leaf Dr. Wright said, 'I can only hazard a conjecture that it belongs to the eighth or ninth century¹.' These indications, though slight, are consistent, and point to a distinct decadence in the script from the eighth century, attendant, no doubt, on the decadence of the sect to which the dialect and the characters belonged. Now if our facsimiles be compared with fol. 14 of Add. 14,450, the oldest specimen in the British Museum, it will be recognised that our four leaves are at least not inferior to it in beauty of execution, as well as in freedom from what Wright calls the almost hideous exaggeration and distortion of every peculiarity, with which the latest hands abound. The writing is bold and firm, and not inelegant, and certainly seems to belong to the best period of the style². It will not, I think, be unreasonable to suppose that it is at least as old as the palimpsest leaf of Add. 14,450, and I am somewhat disposed to believe that it is a little older. In any case, it can hardly be assigned to a later date than the eighth century. The single leaf, which is written in the smaller characters of another hand, is also very ancient; but I am inclined to think that it belonged to a MS. which was written a little later than that to which the four leaves belonged.

After I had arrived independently at these conclusions, I received an interesting confirmation of my opinion. Copies of the three collocations were submitted to the Rev. George Margoliouth³, whose position

¹ *Op. cit.* Part III, p. xxxii. Fol. 26 b, I adduce with hesitation, because Wright was disposed to 'assign it to the tenth or eleventh century.' The reader should compare Plate XIX with the facsimile in *Miniscalchi Erisso*. Mr. G. Margoliouth has called my attention to an ambiguity in Wright's statements about fol. 14 of Add. 14,450. *Op. cit.* I, p. 55, he remarks that the fol. is 'perhaps of not much later date than the rest of the volume.' Shortly before he had said that the writing of the MS. 'is a fine regular Estrangela of the seventh century.' If with these statements his opinion on p. xxxii of *Catalogue* Part III be compared, it will be seen that he exhibits an uncertainty about the date. But Mr. Margoliouth adds, 'It certainly appears to me that the underlying text of fol. 14 is not later than the seventh century (at any rate not much later), especially considering that the text written over it cannot, I think, be placed very late either.'

² Land, by a comparison of individual letters, especially the  and , arranged the extant Palestinian documents in a series, of which the *St. Petersburg Gospel Fragments* are among the oldest, and the London *Hymns* among the youngest. Comparing this series with the dates which Wright gave to the London MSS. he finds an independent confirmation of his judgment. *Op. cit.* pp. 213, 232.

³ C. C. C., Camb., Tyrwhitt Hebrew Scholar, and now Senior Assistant in the Oriental Department of Printed Books and MSS., British Museum.

affords peculiar facilities for forming a judgment on the date and character of an Oriental document. After a careful inspection, he wrote to me as follows:—

‘There certainly is a considerable likeness between the Palestinian text of fol. 14 in Add. 14,450 and the Syriac of your MS. I am myself inclined to think that the former is somewhat older, as the writing is a little more flowing, but much difference there is not between the two, and it appears to me that both may belong to the seventh century. You would, I suppose, look upon the smaller page as showing a smaller hand of about the same age, and this is also the impression which it at present makes upon me.’

The remark that the odd leaf may be written in ‘a smaller hand of about the same age,’ is important. A difference of hand in these and other ancient documents, may indicate rather a different scribe, or a different locality, than a different date. It may also be well to point out, that the absence of vowel-marks from our fragments is not, in such writings, an indication of antiquity. A reference to Plates XIX and XX in the *B. M. Catalogue*, Part III, will show that much younger Palestinian MSS. were written without vowels; but the Vatican *Evangelarium*, according to the facsimile in *Miniscalchi Erizzo*, has more diacritical points than can now be distinguished in our fragments.

In a subsequent communication, Mr. Margoliouth informed me that Professor Land, of Leyden, had seen the collotypes, and thought the hand of the four leaves might be a little older than that of fol. 14 of Add. 14,450. I trust that the courteous and learned Professor will pardon my quoting as an opinion, what at present is the result of a first impression; still, his words, as far as they go, are an interesting and independent confirmation, by an authority on the subject, of the view we expressed above. To sum up then, we may, with considerable confidence, conclude that the four pieces are in a seventh or eighth century hand, while the fifth fragment was written somewhat, but not much, later.

5. With greater certainty can we determine the dialect of these fragments, and the version, or versions, to which they belong. The leaves are written in the characters which appear to be peculiar to what has been named *Palestinian Syriac*, and the features of that dialect are distinctly marked. *ā* is used, like the Hebrew *א*, in the formation of the future tense. Chaldaic forms, Hebrew words, and

many words and forms which can only be paralleled from Adler's *Evangeliarium* and the related documents, abound in the short compass of the few verses which our fragments contain. From all these facts it is clear that the fragments are portions of translations into the Palestinian Syriac; but, as they stand at present alone, and we have no other MSS. of translations of the same parts with which to compare them, it is impossible yet to decide whether these, and the other extant remains, all belong to one version, or whether there were several versions of larger or smaller parts of the Bible, by different hands. It is however significant that in the Gospels, where comparison of documents is possible, it is evident that the extant remains are all parts of different copies of the same text¹. But this might be expected in the case of *Evangelia*.

6. The reader will judge for himself from the collotypes that, in the preparation of this edition of the fragments, the work of deciphering has not been easy. But by patient labour in bright sunlight the difficulties have been overcome, and I am confident of the correctness of the transcripts as a whole, although a few words and letters are perhaps not quite certain. We have printed the Syriac in columns, each of which agrees in all respects with the corresponding column in the MS., except that the exigencies of type-setting do not always allow that regularity in length of line, which the handwriting exhibits. The text is given exactly as it stands in the MSS., so that—

(1) Letters or words which are illegible, and have been restored, are added in brackets.

(2) The plural marks, and stops, are only given where they can be read in the original. Those which are supplied are expressed by small circles.

(3) But the point on *ḥ* has been added where illegible, as it was evidently the rule of the scribe to use it, and the absence of it may be attributed to the state of the MS. at that particular place.

(4) Smaller type has been used where a Title, Colophon, or Gloss was written smaller in the MS.

The translation is as literal, and as much in the exact order of the Syriac text, as the English idiom will allow. Words which are not in the Syriac are put in italic type in the English. The representation of

¹ In Land, *op. cit.* IV (*Evangelia Londinensia et Petropolitana*), it will be seen how defects of words, and even letters, can in the London (pp. 114–119) and in the St. Petersburg (pp. 144, 145) be supplied from the Roman copy.

Semitic names in English is always difficult: in these fragments the difficulty is increased by the ambiguity of the originals, through the absence of vowels. Particulars will be found in the Notes; but in general it is to be remarked that long *o* may be long *u*, or vice versa, as **o** stands for both. The short vowels are inserted by analogy, but in many cases the *ä*, *ē*, or *ī*, which has been adopted, may be changed for one of the other two. The consonants **λ**, **Δ**, **Ϸ** are represented by *l*, *c*, *k*. The reader is reminded that *c* never has in Syriac the sound of a sibilant.

7. In the Notes on the Syriac text, we have touched on various questions which arise in connection with the character of the translations contained in the present fragments.

(1) In regard to the Old Testament, we have indicated some points of resemblance and of difference between our text and the Peshitto. The reader who compares the two, line by line, will discover that the divergences are so numerous, that they forbid the supposition that ours is a revision of the Peshitto. The resemblance to the LXX. is certainly striking¹; but the influence of the Hebrew is so apparent, that it is impossible that the version could have assumed its present form without some reference to the Hebrew original.

(2) In connection with our New Testament fragments, three interesting questions arise: (α) How are they related to the remains of the Palestine Version? (β) Is the translation dependent on the Peshitto, and its Harclean revision? (γ) To what type of Greek text do these fragments bear witness?

(α) The number of Palestinian forms, and of words common to our text and Adler's MS., demonstrate that the fragments now edited, and those which were known before, are all parts of one vernacular version, although, as we said on the preceding page, there is no evidence to show whether the separate books were translated at one time, or at intervals, and whether, or not, any revisions took place.

(β) To afford materials for an answer to the second question, we have set out in parallel columns a passage in the three forms of the Peshitto, the Harclean, and our MS. No one who pursues the comparison

¹ 'Psalms e versione Graeca LXX. Interpretum translatos esse, jam e numeris quibus inscripti sunt didiceram;' Land, *op. cit.* IV, p. 190. See also our note on p. xxix.

throughout the fragments can doubt that they show abundant signs of being an independent translation from the Greek. The divergences from the Peshitto are not like those of the Harclean, which are due to the attempt to force the older Syriac into a resemblance to the Greek. The differences between the text of our fragments and the Peshitto, or the Harclean, are altogether such as would be found in a version made at a different epoch, amid other surroundings, by other hands.

(γ) On the assumption that our fragments are parts of the version of which Adler's MS. represents the Gospels, it may be supposed that a similar type of Greek text underlies them all. It has usually been held that the 'Jerusalem Syriac' bears witness, for the most part, to the readings of the oldest uncials and those cursives which agree with them¹; but it is not true that it lends a constant support to what has been called the Pre-Syrian, or Neutral, type of text. An inspection of the *Delectus Lectionum* which Professor Sanday has set out, with much clearness, in his excellent *Appendix*², will show that the *Versio Hierosolymitana*, as often as not, sides with the Peshitto against the reading of the codex Vaticanus. A complete solution of the problem must be left to the student who will institute an exhaustive examination of the occasion of every word and phrase in the N. T. *Palestinian Syriac*. Our Notes suggest the answer, which may ultimately be given. It will be seen from them that while some of the readings of recent editors, and of cod. B, in the Pauline Epistles, are supported, others are not. Our translation, which occupies an independent position as a Syriac Version, bears also an independent witness to a class of Greek documents, which exhibited a form of text, in part eclectic, in part distinguished by peculiar readings.

The friends who are named in these pages, and others, have helped me by many suggestions, which I have gladly adopted, but without thereby holding them responsible for any of the critical opinions expressed in the course of the work.

¹ Adler's words are:—'Ostendimus, eam [sc. *Vers. Hier.*] antiquissimis auctoritatibus suffragari, perantiquos codices, Vaticanum et Cantabrigiensem plerumque sequi, Patribus quoque, Origeni, Chrysostomo, aliis, non raro adstipulari.' *Verss. Syrr.* p. 201; cf. Scrivener's *Introduction*, Ed. 3, p. 330.

To much the same effect Miniscalchi Erizzo, *op. cit.* II, p. xlviii. So Land:—'Quod jam in Psalmis observavimus, versionem Palaestinam cum nullo Graeco libro hodie superstitie omnino conspirare, idem et in Evangeliiis apparet.' *Op. cit.* IV, p. 199.

² *Nov. Test. c. Tribus Appendicibus* (Lloyd et Sanday), 1889.

A COMPARISON OF THE VERSIONS OF 2 TIMOTHY I. 11-18
IN THE PESHITTO, THE HARCLEAN, AND THE
BODLEIAN PALESTINIAN FRAGMENTS.

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

¹ In margine MSt **و. ح. ح.**

We have selected this passage for comparison in the three versions, because it is one where the Palestinian text can be exhibited with certainty. The reader can judge for himself from the photograph, which includes ll. 1-21. Every word is legible, though some of the points are doubtful, or have been altogether effaced. The Harclean is printed from *White*¹, the Peshitto from the usual text, without regard to variants, for they would not affect the general relation of the Peshitto to the Harclean and the Palestinian. The passage represents somewhat more than one-sixteenth of the text in our fragments, and suffices to show the fundamental difference between the Palestinian and the Old Syriac² and its Harclean revision. The difference is not merely that of dialect—changes of forms and words to adapt the text to the vernacular of a district—it is much wider. The Harclean, though often divergent from the Peshitto, is evidently based upon it. The Palestinian differs from both, sentence by sentence. Such agreement as exists appears to be accidental, and due to the identity of the underlying Greek in those places. Even this short passage contains three various readings:—l. 2, *ἐθνῶν* omitted, which *Har.* and *Pesh.* have; l. 17, 'and another Hermogenes,' l. 24, 'with Him' for 'with *our*' [*Pesh.*] 'with *the*' [*Harcl.*] 'Lord.' It can hardly be doubted that the Palestinian, whether older or younger than the Peshitto, is independent of it, at least in the Pauline Epistles, and represents a different form of Greek text.

¹ *N. T. Vers. Syr. Philoxeniana* [Heracleensis] c. *Interp. et Annot. Josephi White.*

² The reader is aware that Dr. Hort and others have applied this name to the Curetonian. That the Curetonian preceded the Peshitto is only an opinion. In *Studia Biblica III* I have shown that the latter bears no traces of being a revision of the former. If the Syriac *Tetraevangelium* is really based on an older translation, yet without doubt it was brought into its present form at a very remote period; and the same is true of the other parts of the Peshitto N. T., the *Apostolos*, the *Praxis*, and the *Three Catholic Epistles*. In the present state of our information about the history of the Peshitto, the assertion often made that 'it was revised in the fourth century,' is possibly incorrect, and certainly premature.

While these pages are passing through the press, the discovery is announced of another 'Curetonian MS.,' said to contain an almost complete text. We are curious to know if this fresh witness can give further evidence about the relation of the Curetonian to the Peshitto.

THE REMAINS OF THE PALESTINIAN VERSION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

The largest and most important portion of these remains is that which has been longest known to scholars, the Evangelistarium in the Vatican Library, which was described by Adler in his *Versiones Syriacae*, published in the year 1789. Smaller portions have been found amongst the Nitrian MSS., which were acquired by the British Museum between the years 1838 and 1864. Other fragments have been brought from the East by Tischendorf, and are now in the Imperial Library, St. Petersburg. Another small fragment was discovered in 1889 by Mr. J. Rendel Harris, amongst the MSS. in the library of the Convent of St. Catharine, on Mount Sinai. To these we can now add the five fragments which are described in this Anecdote. In all, the extant portions of the Palestinian Version are as follows:—

NUMBERS iv. 46, 47; 49—v. 2; 3, 4; 6–8.

[Bodleian Library, Oxford—perhaps eighth cent.]

DEUTERONOMY vi. 4–16; vii. 25, 26; xiii. 6–17.

[Imperial Library, St. Petersburg—seventh or eighth cent.]

PSALMS xliii. 12–27 (Heb. xlv. 11–26); xlv (Heb. xlv); xlv (Heb. xlv); xlv (Heb. xlvii); xlviii. 15 (Heb. xlix. 14)—end; xlix (Heb. l). 1–9; lv. 7 (Heb. lvi. 8)—end; lvi. 1–7 (Heb. lvii. 1–8); lxxvii (Heb. lxxviii). 52–65; lxxxii (Heb. lxxxii); lxxxii (Heb. lxxxiii). 1–10; lxxxix (Heb. xc); xc (Heb. xci). 1–12.

[British Museum, Add. 14,664, foll. 22–29—tenth or eleventh cent.]

PROVERBS ix. 1–11.

ISAIAH xi. 6–10; xiv. 28–32; xv. 1–5; xl. 1–8; 9–12.

JOB xxi. 1–9.

[Imperial Library, St. Petersburg—seventh or eighth cent.]

THE FOUR GOSPELS. The whole, or a part, of nearly every chapter of each of the Evangelists is represented; there being in all about two-thirds of the text of the Gospels. Indexes of chapters and verses are given in *Land*, pp. 178, 179, 194-197, and in *Miniscalchi Erizzo*, pp. 51-89.

[The British Museum (Add. 14,450, fol. 14—? seventh cent.; 14,664, foll. 17, 20, 21—tenth or eleventh cent.), The Vatican—A.D. 1030, The Imperial Library, St. Petersburg—? seventh cent.]

ACTS xiv. 6-13, in a hand of uncertain, but not very early, date.

[The Imperial Library, St. Petersburg.]

THE PAULINE EPISTLES.

GALATIANS. Eleven verses, or part of verses, viz. ii. 3-5, 12-14; iii. 17, 18, 24-28.

[Mount Sinai—perhaps eighth cent.]

COLOSSIANS iv. 12-18.

1 THESSALONIANS i. 1-3; iv. 3-15.

2 TIMOTHY i. 10—ii. 7.

TITUS i. 11—ii. 8.

[Bodleian Library—seventh or eighth cent.]

The London and St. Petersburg texts, which are all fragmentary, have been published by Professor Land in *Anecdota Syriaca*, tom. iv, 1875. From this volume the references given above are taken.

The Vatican Evangelistarium was edited in sumptuous style by Count F. Miniscalchi Erizzo, in the work entitled *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum*, 1861-1864.

The Sinaitic leaf has been printed by Mr. J. Rendel Harris in *Biblical Fragments from Mount Sinai*, 1890.

The reader may also consult:—

Adler's *Versiones Syriacae*.

Davidson on the Syriac Versions in Kitto's *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*, 3rd ed., 1866.

Duval, *Traité de Grammaire Syriaque*, ll. cc. (p. v sup.) and § 11.

Kautzsch, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramaischen*, § 5. 9.

Tischendorf's *Notitia ed. cod. Bibl. Sinaitici*, 1860, p. 49, and *Anecdota Sacra et Profana*, 1861, p. xi and p. 13.

Wright's Article, *Syriac Literature*, Encyclopaedia Britannica xxii, pp. 825, 826.

Zahn's *Forschungen*, 1 Theil, 1881, pp. 329-350.

The late Dr. P. A. de Lagarde made a fresh collation of the Vatican Evangelistarium, with the intention of bringing out a new edition, which has been recently published in a posthumous work entitled *Bibliothecae Syriacae a Paulo de Lagarde collectae*. Pages 258-402 contain the *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum*. The text is set out in the order of the Gospels, instead of that of the Church Lessons, and notes are appended on the readings of the MS. and its correctors, and the edition of Miniscalchi Erizzo.

The portions included in the above list, though none are complete books, and some contain but a few verses, yet, when taken together, are evidence for the existence of a large part of the Holy Scriptures in the Palestinian Version. They do not, of course, amount to a proof that the whole Bible was translated into this dialect, nor do they suffice to determine what was the Canon of such a translation, if it ever was made. The Gospel portions belong to Service Books, and so do the O. T. portions, and the fragment from Acts, in the judgment of Dr. Land¹. Our own fragment from *Numbers* bears no indication of its origin. But it is to be remembered that Lesson Books do not belong to the earliest periods of transcription. MSS. were marked for the Lessons long before separate copies were made for use in the Church. It is probable that the Syro-Palestinian dialect was the vernacular of some of the earliest Christian bodies, and analogy leads to the almost certain conclusion that these early converts possessed copies of the Scriptures in their vernacular for some time before they arranged those Scriptures in separate books for use in the Church services. Our oldest fragments appear to date from the eighth century at least². To that era belongs

¹ He considers that all the London and St. Petersburg fragments are parts of Service Books, with one exception, the fol. 55 of the St. Petersburg volume; and of this he writes thus:—'fol. 55 non rescriptum. Videtur e Diatessaro nescio quo petatum esse,' *op. cit.* p. 188. 'Attamen de hujus libri ratione e fragmentis nostris judicare non licet,' p. 205.

² Mr. Rendel Harris says of his leaf, 'Perhaps we shall not be far wrong in referring it to the eighth century,' *op. cit.* p. xiv.

the commencement of the composition of Church Lesson Books¹. There is no proof that the Syro-Palestinian Lectionaries are translations from Greek Lectionaries; and it may be regarded as certain that they were preceded by complete copies of the Gospels, the Acts, and the Pauline Epistles, and of part, if not of the whole of the Old Testament. The Bodleian N. T. fragments appear to have belonged to such a complete copy, and perhaps the Sinaitic leaf also. The colophon appended to *Colossians* (see p. 10) indicates a transcript of something more than a Set of Lessons; and this is not contradicted by the Rubric inserted in the text of 1 *Thessalonians iv*, for Rubrics were often interpolated by Syriac scribes into copies of the complete text².

¹ 'None [of the books of Ecclesiastical Lessons] are believed to be older than the eighth or possibly the ninth century.' *Westcott and Hort*, Introduction, p. 76.

² Examples are:—*Add. Mus. Brit.* 14,470, a Peshitto Tetraevangelium of the fifth or sixth cent.; the Tetraevangelium *Add.* 14,455, sixth cent.; the Nestorian Tetraevangelium *Add.* 17,114, sixth or seventh cent.; the Apostolos *Add.* 17,122. Many MSS., if not most, have some Lessons, perhaps those which were most important, indicated in the text, although only a few copies are rubricated throughout.

THE TYPE OF GREEK TEXT SUPPORTED BY THE SYRIAC OF THE FOUR FRAGMENTS OF THE PAULINE EPISTLES.

[Mr. E. N. Bennett, Fellow of Hertford College, has very kindly assisted me in comparing the readings of the Palestinian fragments of the Pauline Epistles with the Greek text. The following section has been written by him as a convenient summary of the results of our observations. It will be seen that Mr. Bennett's remarks tend to confirm the opinions which we have already expressed¹ on the character of the translation, and on the type of Greek text from which it was made.]

As the four fragments before us cover less than sixty verses, it is impossible to draw from them any very decided inferences as to the nature of the Greek text underlying the Palestinian version of the Pauline Epistles. But the following collation, which, I fear, must necessarily be imperfect, seems to fully confirm the view already taken by Westcott and Hort and others, that the Palestinian contains a text entirely different from the other Syriac versions. Even in the few verses before us the variety of reading is surprising and Land's verdict holds good—'Versionem Palaestinam cum nullo Graeco libro hodie superstite omnino conspirare.' The Greek text used by the translator must have been a curious intermixture of Western and other types. The Syriac favours \aleph against B twice, and B against \aleph three times. The combination \aleph B is followed five times and in four cases deserted. The text harmonizes with the Peshitto in opposition to the Harclean some seven times, though the reverse is less common; it sometimes sides with both these versions against the Greek MSS., and sometimes opposes them. Tischendorf's view, that the Palestinian text resembles most closely that of B and D, is scarcely corroborated by the present fragments, which agree with the combination three times, and diverge from it twice,—though, as remarked above, our data in the present instance are too scanty to supply any definite conclusion on this point.

¹ See *Introduction*, § 7 (2); also pp. xiv, xv.

In general the version is correct¹, and in only two places has the translator seriously missed the sense of his original, viz. in 1 Thess. iv. 10-11 and Titus ii. 7. In the first of these passages the author of the version has evidently been puzzled by the phrase φιλοτιμείσθαι ἡσυχάζειν. He has translated the Greek as if there were a καί between the two verbs, has transposed the order of περισσεύειν and φιλοτιμείσθαι and taken the latter to mean 'render honour,' or perhaps 'increase,' for the Syriac is doubtful. In the second passage ἀφθορίαν is translated as if it were an adjective agreeing with διδασκαλία, but it is difficult to see why ~~ܠܐܘܬܘܪܝܐ~~ has been made to correspond to σεμνότητα.

Amongst minor mistakes are Θεὸν εἰδέναι turned by 'to see God' in Titus i. 16, and in ii. 7 of the same Epistle περὶ πάντα rendered as if it were περὶ πάντων. In Col. iv. 15 the Syriac has kept the masculine form Νυμφᾶς, while it follows B and Harcl. text in reading αὐτῆς (the second hand of B accentuates Νύμφαν). The omission of δ ἀγαπητός in Col. iv. 14, and the reading τὴν ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ (ver. 16), are almost unique; there is no other authority, as far as I know, for the absence of ἀλλ in 1 Thess. iv. 10.

At the end of the Epistle to the Colossians we find the common form of the subscription—ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ῥώμης διὰ Τυχικοῦ καὶ Ονησίμου—preceded by a clause found in D and a few other MSS.

The question of the Greek text which underlies so ancient a version as the one before us is full of interest, and we may hope that its fuller solution will be facilitated before long, by the acquisition of fresh materials. I have been informed by Mr. J. Rendel Harris, that a considerable number of Palestinian fragments exist on Mount Sinai, and the examination of these would doubtless throw fresh light on the subject.

The following notes are based mainly on the text of Tregelles, but the references to the Peshitto and the Harclean have been verified in *Leusden and Schaaf* and in *White*.

COLOSSIANS IV. 12-18:

iv. 12. Ἰησοῦ with \aleph A B C [against D Pesh. Harcl.]

πεπληρωμένοι with Pesh. Harcl. text [against \aleph A B C D Harcl. marg.]

¹ Cp. Land, *Anecd. Syr.* iv. 197, versionem Palaestinam ab hominibus haud indoctis ad varios Graecos libros emendatam et immutato sermonis usui accommodatam esse.

13. *πόνον* (ut vid., see note below¹) with \aleph A B C [against Pesh. and Harcl. (*ζῆλον*) D (*κόπον*)].
14. omits *δ ἀγαπητός* with 17.
15. *αὐτῆς* with B Harcl. text [against \aleph A C (*αὐτῶν*) D Pesh. Harcl. marg. (*αὐτοῦ*)].
16. *τὴν ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ* with F G (?) *g eam quae in laodo t ae cia est.*
omits (ut vid.) *καί* before *ὑμεῖς* with D, but seems to insert *καί* before *Ἀρχιππῳ*.
18. omits *ἀμὴν* with \aleph A B C [against D Pesh. Harcl.]

1 THESSALONIANS I. 1-3, IV. 3-15.

- i. 1. adds (after *εἰρήνη*) *ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* with \aleph A C.
Harcl. text c. aster. [against B Pesh. Harcl.]
omits *καί* (before first *πατρί*) [against Harcl.]
2. adds *ὑμῶν* (after *μυρίαν*) with C D Pesh. Harcl. [against \aleph A B].
3. *τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν* with D Pesh. Harcl. [against \aleph A B *ὑμῶν τοῦ ἔργ.*
τῆς πίστ.]
- iv. 3. *τῆς* (before *πορνείας*) ut vid., see note below².
4. *ἐν τιμῇ καὶ ἀγιασμῷ* (ut vid.)
7. *ὑμᾶς* with Pesh.
8. omits *καί* (before *δόντα*) with A B Pesh. [against \aleph D Harcl.]
ὑμᾶς with \aleph B D Pesh. Harcl. marg. [against A Harcl. text].
9. *ἔχετε* with \aleph A Pesh. [against B D Harcl.]
10. omits *ἀλλ*.

¹ The text has *ܐܘܢܢܐ*, which I take to be a *Palest.* noun of the form *ܡܩܘܡ* (*חוש = חשש*); see notes on 1 Thess. iv. 5 and 2 Tim. ii. 3. Buxtorf (col. 845) cites a form *ܡܝܚܘܫ* *dolor*, and this (or *cura*) is the meaning of the Neo-Syr. *ܡܝܚܘܫ* (Stoddard in *Thes. Syr.* 1393). The root occurs several times in *Hier.* in the sense of *suffer, endure*—e. g. for *ܡܝܚܘܫܐ* Mark v. 26, *ܡܝܚܘܫ* Luke xxiv. 26, [*κακῶς*] *ܡܝܚܘܫܐ* Mat. xvii. 15. No doubt *ܐܘܢܢܐ* connotes many forms of mental affection, like the word *ܡܝܚܘܫ*, which *Pesh.* has in 1 Thess. iv. 5, although at Col. iv. 13 it uses *ܡܝܚܘܫܐ*. As *Palest.* has *ܐܘܢܢܐ* in both places, I am inclined to think they read *πόνος* at Col. iv. 13, and took it in the sense of the *πάθος* of 1 Thess. iv. 5. It is, I suppose, conceivable that they even had *πάθος* in the text of Colossians.—G. H. G.

² Each of the three (*Pesh.*, *Harcl.*, *Palest.*) has the *definite* form *ܡܝܚܘܫܐ*; but then (see Duval, *Gram. Syr.* § 299) this form in Syriac does not always indicate what would be in Greek or English, a noun with the definite article. Still we find that at 2 Tim. i. 11, where the nouns are clearly indefinite, the definite forms are not used, but *ܡܝܚܘܫܐ*, *ܡܝܚܘܫܐ*, *ܡܝܚܘܫܐ*.—G. H. G.

- 11. omits *ιδίαις* (ut vid.) with B D [against \aleph A].
omits *καί* (before *ὑμῖν*) [against Harcl.]
- 13. *θελομεν* with \aleph A B D [against Pesh. Harcl.]
κεκοιμημένων (ut vid.) with D [against \aleph A B Pesh. Harcl.]
- 14. *καὶ ὁ θεός* (ut vid.) with Pesh. [against B Harcl.]

2 *TIMOTHY I. 10—II. 7.*

- i. 11. omits *ἐθνῶν* with \aleph A [against C D Pesh. Harcl.]
- 16. *ὁ κύριος ἔλεος* with Pesh. Harcl.
- 18. adds *μοι* (after *δηκόντησεν*) with Pesh. Harcl.
- ii. 3. *συγκακοπάθησον* (ut vid.) with \aleph A C D Harcl. marg. [against Pesh. Harcl. text].
- 7. *δ* (before *λέγω*) with \aleph A C Pesh. [against D Harcl.]

TITUS I. 11—II. 8.

- ii. 3. *ἱεροπρεπεῖ* with C Pesh. Harcl. [against \aleph A D Harcl. marg.]
μὴ οἶνφ with D Pesh. Harcl. [against \aleph A C].
- 5. *οἰκουργούς* (ut vid.) with \aleph A C D [against Harcl. marg.]
omits (after *θεοῦ*) *καὶ ἡ διδασκαλία* [against C Harcl.]

E. N. B.

LIST OF PALESTINIAN AND OTHER WORDS AND FORMS.

The *Syro-Palestinian* dialect contains:—(a) Many Chaldee words and forms, some Hebrew words, and a few adapted from Arabic and Greek. (β) Grammatical forms, nearly all of which are also Chaldaic. (γ) Roots used in a sense not common in ordinary Syriac. (δ) Some terms, and forms of words, which appear to be exclusively Palestinian.

Most of the Palestinian words in the following list are included in the lists in *Land* and *Miniscalchi Erizzo*. Their lists, in conjunction with ours, will supply an interesting specimen of the Palestinian vocabulary.

ܐܢܝܢ 1 Thess. i. 1.
ܐܢܝܢ Num. iv. 49. See also note
on Tit. i. 12.
ܐܢܝܢ Tit. ii. 1, 7.
ܐܢܝܢ 1 Thess. iv. 8.
ܐܢܝܢ Col. iv. 18.
ܐܢܝܢ Col. iv. 15, 2 Tim. i. 12.
ܐܢܝܢ Col. iv. 15, etc.
ܐܢܝܢ Num. iv. 46.
ܐܢܝܢ 2 Tim. ii. 7.
ܐܢܝܢ 1 Thess. i. 2, etc.; and see
note on i. 2.
ܐܢܝܢ 1 Thess. iv. 6.
ܐܢܝܢ 2 Tim. i. 16.
ܐܢܝܢ 2 Tim. ii. 6.
ܐܢܝܢ 2 Tim. ii. 5.
ܐܢܝܢ Num. iv. 49.
ܐܢܝܢ 2 Tim. i. 11.
ܐܢܝܢ 2 Tim. i. 14.
ܐܢܝܢ 2 Tim. i. 10.

ܐܢܝܢ Rubric, p. 14, l. 20.
ܐܢܝܢ Num. v. 7, 8.
ܐܢܝܢ 1 Thess. iv. 14, etc.
ܐܢܝܢ Tit. ii. 7.
ܐܢܝܢ 2 Tim. ii. 2.
ܐܢܝܢ Tit. ii. 7.
ܐܢܝܢ 1 Thess. i. 2.
ܐܢܝܢ 2 Tim. ii. 1, 4.
ܐܢܝܢ Col. iv. 16.
ܐܢܝܢ 1 Thess. iv. 10.
ܐܢܝܢ Tit. ii. 8.
ܐܢܝܢ for ܐܢܝܢ, 1 Thess. iv. 8.
ܐܢܝܢ = ܐܢܝܢ Tit. ii. 4, 5.
ܐܢܝܢ 1 Thess. iv. 5.
ܐܢܝܢ 2 Tim. i. 12.
ܐܢܝܢ Num. iv. 49.
ܐܢܝܢ Num. iv. 49, v. 4.
ܐܢܝܢ Tit. i. 14.

- ١
 ١٥١ 1 Thess. iv. 3.
- ٢
 ١٥١ 1 Thess. iv. 9, 2 Tim. i. 13.
 ١٥١ 1 Thess. i. 3.
 ١٥١ 2 Tim. i. 15, ii. 2.
 ١٥١ 2 Tim. ii. 3.
 ١٥١ Tit. i. 12.
 ١٥١ 2 Tim. ii. 1.
 ١٥١ Col. iv. 17.
 ١٥١ Num. v. 7.
 ١٥١ Col. iv. 18, 1 Thess. i. 1.
 ١٥١ 1 Thess. iv. 12.
 ١٥١ Tit. i. 13.
- ٣
 ١٥١ Tit. ii. 7; ١٥١ Col. iv. 12, 13; ١٥١ 1 Thess. iv. 9.
 ١٥١ Tit. ii. 7.
 ١٥١ Tit. ii. 4.
- ٤
 ١٥١ in *ful.*, Num. v. 2, etc.
 ١٥١ Tit. ii. 4.
 ١٥١ Num. v. 8; cf. 1 Thess. iv. 4 n.
 ١٥١ Tit. ii. 2.
 ١٥١ Tit. ii. 4.
 ١٥١ 1 Thess. iv. 6.
 ١٥١ 2 Tim. i. 12.
 ١٥١ 2 Tim. ii. 2.
 ١٥١ Num. v. 3.
 ١٥١ Col. iv. 12, etc.; see note, p. xxx.
 ١٥١ 2 Tim. ii. 4.
- ٥
 ١٥١ Num. iv. 49, etc., and see Col. iv. 18 n.
 ١٥١ 2 Tim. i. 18.
- ٦
 ١٥١ Num. v. 4, Tit. i. 13.
 ١٥١ Num. iv. 47, etc.
 ١٥١ 1 Thess. iv. 12.
 ١٥١ 1 Thess. iv. 5, 11.
 ١٥١ Tit. ii. 3.
 ١٥١ 1 Thess. i. 1.
- ٧
 ١٥١ 1 Thess. iv. 6, 13, Tit. i. 11.
 ١٥١ 2 Tim. i. 12.
- ٨
 ١٥١ 1 Thess. i. 3.
 ١٥١ 1 Thess. iv. 14, 2 Tim. ii. 2.
 ١٥١ Tit. i. 14.
 ١٥١ Col. iv. 13, 1 Thess. iv. 5 n., and p. xxii. n. 1.
 ١٥١ Tit. i. 16.
 ١٥١ 1 Thess. iv. 5.
 ١٥١ 1 Thess. iv. 13.
 ١٥١ 1 Thess. iv. 10.
 ١٥١ 2 Tim. i. 13.
 ١٥١ Tit. ii. 3.
 ١٥١ Tit. i. 15.
 ١٥١ 2 Tim. i. 12.
 ١٥١ 2 Tim. ii. 2.
 ١٥١ Col. iv. 13.
 ١٥١ 1 Thess. iv. 13.
 ١٥١ Tit. ii. 3.
 ١٥١ Tit. i. 14.
 ١٥١ Tit. i. 15.

متقحي Tit. ii. 3.
مماهه 1 Thess. i. 2.

م
م 2 Tim. ii. 6.

م
م Num. v. 3.
م Tit. ii. 3.
م Tit. ii. 5.
م Num. v. 6, 7.

م
م 2 Tim. ii. 4.
م Col. iv. 12, and see 1 Thess.
i. 2 n.

م Num. iv. 49.
م Num. iv. 47; cf. 1 Thess. i. 3.
م Col. iv. 13.
م Num. iv. 47.
م 2 Tim. i. 14.
م 1 Thess. iv. 6, 8.

م
م *inversum* (2) 2 Tim. i. 12 n.
م 2 Tim. ii. 6.
م Num. iv. 47.
م Tit. i. 16.
م 2 Tim. i. 12, 14.

3
م Col. iv. 12.
م 1 Thess. iv. 12.

م
م 1 Thess. iv. 4.
م Tit. i. 14.
م 2 Tim. ii. 6.
م Tit. i. 12 *marg.*
م Rubric, p. 14, l. 20.
م Col. iv. 16.
م Rubric, p. 14, l. 19.
م Tit. i. 13.

م
م 2 Tim. i. 16.
م, م Num. iv. 46.

م
م 1 Thess. iv. 10.
م Num. v. 2, 4.
م Col. iv. 18, etc.
م Col. iv. 12, etc.
م Tit. i. 12 *marg.*
م 1 Thess. iv. 13.
م 1 Thess. iv. 6.
م Col. iv. 17.
م 1 Thess. iv. 7.

ل
م 2 Tim. ii. 7.
م 1 Thess. iv. 5.
م Tit. i. 11.
م Rubric, p. 14, l. 19.
م 1 Thess. iv. 3.
م 2 Tim. i. 10, Tit. ii. 7 n.

NOTES

ON THE VERSES CONTAINED IN THE FRAGMENTS.

ABBREVIATIONS.

<i>Buxt.</i>	= Joh. Buxtorfi Lex. Chald. Talmud. et Rabbin.
<i>Cast.</i>	= Edm. Castelli Lexicon Syriacum ed. J. D. Michaelis.
<i>Hier.</i>	= The Words and Forms of the <i>Evangelistarium Hierosolymitanum</i> .
<i>Lagarde</i>	= Bibliothecae Syriacae a P. de Lagarde collectae, 1892.
<i>Levy</i>	= Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim, von J. Levy.
<i>Palest.</i>	= The Dialect of the Remains of the Palestinian Version.
<i>Sanday</i>	= Nov. Test. Graec. cum Appendicibus, curante Gul. Sanday, 1889.
<i>Schaaf</i>	= Car. Schaafii Lex. Syr. Concordantiale.
<i>Thes. Syr.</i>	= Thesaurus Syriacus (R. Payne Smith), Fasc. i-ix, 1847.
<i>WH</i>	= The New Testament in the Original Greek (Westcott & Hort), 1881.

NUMBERS.

iv. 46. *Moshê, Aharon, the Livijê*, Semitic forms, as in the Peshitto (but *there* ܠܝܒܝܬ = L'vijê), although, as will be seen below, the Greek text has been usually followed, while yet the Hebrew has not been neglected. In the N. T. fragments we have ܝܫܘܥ = 'Iησοῦς, instead of the *Pesh.* Jeshua.

[ܐܡܪ] If the noun, and not the adjective, it is a *Palest.* plural emph., like ܐܡܪܝܢ l. 12. ܐܡܪ and its derivatives are always written without the ܐ in old MSS. The *scriptio plena* of the next word is a mark of antiquity, at least it would be in a *Pesh.* manuscript; but it occurs in printed editions.

of Israil] The *Rom.* reading, *Alex.* has ܐܝܬܐ ܝܫܪܐܝܝܠ.

numbered] No doubt some part of ܠܝܒܝܬ preceded; LXX. ἐπισκέψατο, as ver. 49 ἐπισκέπησαν, where we have ܠܝܒܝܬܐ and they were numbered.

[ܠܝܒܝܬ] Final ܠ in our text is sometimes thus furnished with a point, the use of which appears to be somewhat arbitrary. Here it may be a stop, subordinate to the (:) which follows; but cf. ܠܝܒܝܬ, and note on ver. 49.

l. 5. ܐܪ is the word ὄχλος; perhaps there was a reading ἐν τ. ὄχλος. LXX. now κατὰ δῆμους καὶ with *Pesh.* and *Heb.*

l. 6. [𐤀𐤍] The (:) which is not distinct in the collotype, seems to be thus placed for want of room.

47. twenty-five years] So LXX, but *Heb.* and *Pesh.* thirty.

unto the works . . .] Like *πρὸς τὸ ἔργον τῶν ἔργων καὶ τὰ ἔργα τὰ αἰρόμενα*, rather than the Hebrew.

[𐤀𐤍] *Chald.* and *Palest.* form of participle.

[𐤀𐤍] *Palest.*, see *Thes. Syr.* 2779—with *Palest.* suffix, ver. 49, l. 3.

[𐤀𐤍] Apparently a *Palestinian* form; cf. *Neo-Syr.* [𐤀𐤍] is used in *Pesh.* (Num. iii. 26, 31) of the holy vessels and instruments. Perhaps *ἔργα* was taken here in the same sense.

49. [𐤀𐤍] with suffix, for [𐤀𐤍] with suffix; frequent in *Hier.*, and in these fragments.

[𐤀𐤍] for [𐤀𐤍], as [𐤀𐤍] Mat. iv. 6 *Hier.* in *Thes. Syr.* 1549.

[𐤀𐤍] *Elaya* is rare in these fragments, if it occurs at all; we take the point on [𐤀] as diacritical (as l. 11; l. 1, p. 4, is defaced) and read (:) between the two words. Again like LXX. *ἐπὶ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ ἐν αἰρουσιν αὐτοῖ, καὶ ἐπεσκέπησαν.*

[𐤀𐤍] Thus clearly in the MS., with the rare archaic [𐤀] (*Duval*, § 180) and [𐤀] dropped—cf. [𐤀𐤍], fol. 2 r a, l. 3. So in next word [𐤀𐤍], though [𐤀𐤍] also occurs in *Hier.*, cf. *Thes. Syr.* 1003.

The blank line at the end of the verse, which corresponds to the B (Parasha=Section), seems to indicate that the scribe was acquainted with the division of the Hebrew, although the translation so often follows the LXX. The injury to the leaf extends over the next B between ver. 4 and ver. 5. There seems hardly room for another blank line.

v. 2. [𐤀𐤍] And so p. 6, l. 14; cf. p. 4, l. 3. Such differences in spelling are common, even in carefully written Syriac MSS.

[𐤀𐤍] [𐤀] for [𐤀] in the future, *Palest.* and *Chald.* [𐤀] in Syriac usually (*Bernstein Lexicon*) in Chaldee sometimes (*Levy* s. v.) means 'to burn.' Here as *Chald.* [𐤀] ejicere, and *Rab.* [𐤀] emittere—*Buxt.* 2327.

3. [𐤀𐤍] The *παρεμβολή* of the *Rom.* text; *Alex.* *συναγωγή*.

[𐤀𐤍] Chaldee for Syriac [𐤀𐤍]; also in *Hier.*, see *Thes. Syr.* 2542.

your camps] [𐤀𐤍]; so *Pesh.*; *Heb.* and LXX. *their*.

4. [𐤀] (also [𐤀] *Thes. Syr.* 1681) *Hier.*

and sent *them*] retaining *αὐτούς*, which *Alex.* omits.

6. The line is partly illegible, which increases the difficulty of the construction. There can be little doubt about the last word, and the form is frequent in *Hier.* As regards the first, the LXX. having *δοῦναι ἐν ποιήσει*, and the *Heb.* [𐤀𐤍], we restore [𐤀𐤍], since some part of that verb must almost certainly have governed the *acc.* [𐤀𐤍]. Thus we obtain a sentence which is at least as intelligible as the LXX. text.

any offence] The *πασών* of *Rom.* text. 𐤒𐤗 as Col. iv. 7, *q. v.* of the sons of men] Following apparently the *τῶν ἀνθρώπων* of LXX, rather than the *Heb.*

Our text omits 'against the Lord,' as does the LXX, but the translation seems to follow 𐤏𐤍𐤕𐤕𐤕 rather than *παρὸν παρὶν*; for though the latter may represent the Hebrew (see *Schleusner* s. v.), it would hardly suggest the Syriac.

𐤏𐤍 is difficult. In its position it ought to be objective; but that, the sense forbids. When used for *ille*, it usually precedes; see examples in *Thes. Syr.* 1642, and cf. 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍 below. Probably the order is an imitation of the *Heb.* and LXX, but the meaning is rather *αὐτή* than *ἐκείνη*. *Pesh.* is ܐܘܠܐܝܬܐ *that soul*.

7. let him] As LXX; *Heb.* pl. (וְהוֹדוּ), but continues in the singular. The text also supports the *Rom.* *ἐποιήσε*; *Alex.* has *ἥμαρτεν*.

𐤏𐤍] *Hier.* in the sense of 'pay.'

which is upon him] *Pesh.* 'let his sin return upon his head;' both misunderstood the 𐤏𐤍𐤕𐤕𐤕 of the *Heb.* LXX. τὸ κεφάλαιον, omitting the preposition.

𐤏𐤍𐤕𐤕𐤕 *Hier.* form. The phrase means 1 + $\frac{1}{2}$; LXX. τὸ ἐπίπεμπτον.

8. 𐤏𐤍 *Hier.*; cf. 1 Thess. iv. 3 n.

𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍] The LXX. δ ἀγχιστέων, according to the *Rom.* text; *Alex.* omits δ; the Syriac certainly favours the article. *Pesh.* agrees with our text, and both may be renderings of the *Heb.* 𐤏𐤍 in its secondary sense, or they may be taken from the Greek.

In the eleven verses comprised in these two fragments we have *seven* indications of the influence of the Greek—iv. 47 (two), ver. 49, v. 6 (two), ver. 7 and ver. 8; *two* of the Hebrew—iv. 49, v. 6; *one* of the Peshitto—v. 3, and apparently *one independent reading* in iv. 46. It is also to be observed that in the five places where the Roman text of the LXX. differs from the Alexandrine, our Syriac always sides with the Vatican copy. These results are significant, and may be held to justify the assertion¹ that the translation was made from the Greek, and that too of the Vatican type, but that the translator had also some knowledge of the form of the Hebrew text.

COLOSSIANS.

iv. 12. The preceding word was, of course, 𐤏𐤍, as l. 20 *inf.* In this phrase the form 𐤏𐤍 (cf. ver. 18) seems to have been generally used by the scribe; in a

¹ See p. xii, and note on Num. iv. 49.

few places we have inserted ܘ where the MS. is illegible; ver. 14 (the reading is certain) is an exception. We have also the form ܡܠܬܐ Tit. i. 12 *marg.*

ܡܠܬܐ] ܐ for the π. In the last syllable the translator seems to have read ܐ; but doubtless in his days Greek was badly pronounced.

l. 4. Jesus] ܡܫܝܚܐ, a transliteration of 'Ιησοῦς, which even if followed, as here, by the Semitic *Meshecha*, is apparently always used in these fragments for the *Jeshua* of the Peshitto. It occurs frequently, but not always, in *Hier.*, cf. *Thes. Syr.* s.v.

The translator had the longer reading. So Χριστοῦ 'Ιησοῦ in *WH*.

l. 5. ܡܠܬܐ] Cf. Num. iv. 4 *et pass.* *Hier.*, but common in old *Pesh.* MSS.

ܡܠܬܐ in the sense of *time* is *Hier.*

ܡܠܬܐ] ܐ is clearly to be restored; so in the translation of St. Clement (*Thes. Syr.* 1861) we have ܡܠܬܐ for ἀγωνισώμεθα.

behalf] ܡܠܬܐ, with ܐ and similar constructions, in *Hier.*

ܡܠܬܐ] ܐ is certainly to be read, and, no doubt, represents πεπληρωμένοι. The πεπληροφορημένοι of *WH*, in the sense of 'fully assured,' is rendered by ܡܠܬܐ to know, or otherwise paraphrased, in *Pesh.* and *Harcl.*; cf. Luke i. 1, Rom. iv. 21.

ܡܠܬܐ (with ܐ) *Chald.* and in *Hier.*

13. ܡܠܬܐ, ܡܠܬܐ, ܡܠܬܐ, *Hier.* forms. For the ܡܠܬܐ cf. Num. iv. 49, l. 3.

l. 15. See note on 2 Tim. ii. 3. ܡܠܬܐ is apparently *Hier.* for ܡܠܬܐ—intense feeling amounting to pain; here *anxiety*, but 1 Thess. iv. 5 in a bad sense *passion*. Perhaps our text represents the reading of *WH*, and in the very order, πολλὸν πόνον.

Jehirapolis] *Pesh.* ܡܠܬܐ ܡܠܬܐ; *Harcl.* ܡܠܬܐ ܡܠܬܐ, as ܡܠܬܐ = 'Ιησοῦ, Mat. i. 5. ܡܠܬܐ ܡܠܬܐ = 'Ιεροσόλυμα is quoted in *Thes. Syr.* 1570. The ܡ is very faint, but I now incline to read ܐ, which the π would require. Cf. *Introd.* p. vii.

15, l. 4. ܡܠܬܐ ܡܠܬܐ is very indistinct in the MS., but the reading (with ܐ = ܐ and ܡܠܬܐ = ܡܠܬܐ in last syllable) is hardly doubtful; yet the name (see below) is taken for a woman's.

ܡܠܬܐ] *Hier.* It is not *scriptio plena*, like ܡܠܬܐ ver. 12, but is to be pronounced ܡܠܬܐ; see *Thes. Syr.* 80.

Church] Here ܡܠܬܐ, but cf. note on 1 Thess. i. 1.

ܡܠܬܐ] Not οἶκον αὐτῶν (cf. *Sanday* 159) but (as *WH* c. cod. B) the reading is almost certainly ܡܠܬܐ = αὐτῆς. In *Hier.* (see Lagarde's edition *passim*) the usual distinction between ܡܠܬܐ and ܡܠܬܐ seems to be observed.

16. ܡܠܬܐ ܡܠܬܐ] *Pesh.* ܡܠܬܐ ܡܠܬܐ, the proper Syriac form. The masculine suffix ܡܠܬܐ, if not an error, must be Palestinian. Cf. Tit. ii. 4 n., ܡܠܬܐ = ܡܠܬܐ.

in Ladikija] It appears to be certainly ܡܠܬܐ, as though they read ܡܠܬܐ ܡܠܬܐ. Here and in some other places we add the stop which the sense requires.

17. 𐤀] The 𐤀 here is faint, but hardly doubtful. It is clear in the last word of l. 22.

𐤀] *Hier.*, and frequent in the Targums, see *Buxt.* 779.

𐤀] This form of the word appears to be Palestinian.

ll. 21, 22 seem more emphatic than the extant original, as though 𐤀 𐤁𐤁𐤀 𐤀 𐤁𐤁𐤀 𐤀 𐤁𐤁𐤀.
𐤀 𐤁𐤁𐤀.

18. 𐤀] For the various uses of 𐤀 in *Hier.* see *Thes. Syr.* 1642. It serves to rehearse, or emphasize, the noun, both in the nominative and accusative, and cannot always be represented in English. Sometimes it is equivalent to *ipse*, sometimes to a definite article, so that not unfrequently (like 𐤀𐤀, 𐤀𐤀) it is intended as a translation of *ὁ, ἡ, τό*. It may represent what we express by an underline, 'remember my bonds.'

𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 *Palest.* pl. form, cf. *Luc. viii. 29 Hier.*

𐤀] As *Heb.* 𐤀𐤀, and in sense of *χαρίς*, it seems to be rare (cf. *Thes. Syr.* 1329), but is preferred in *Hier.*, and substituted for *Pesh.* and *Harcl.* 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀; it occurs in the similar phrase 1 Thess. i. 1 *inf.* See also 1 Thess. iv. 12.

Amen omitted: a slight indication of the antiquity of the version and its MS.

Kolosaijê, or *Kulusaijê*, for there are no indications of vowels—see *Introd.* p. xii. The termination (and in *Thesalon.*) by analogy of Syriac would be *aije*—see *Thes. Syr.* 3522.

The marks (: :) are given in those places where they are legible in the MS. Perhaps originally each line of the colophon was thus enclosed.

Onisimos] So we restore with *Harcl.* and *vv. ll.* in *Tisch.* p. 749.

1 THESSALONIANS.

Of] The MS. certainly appears to read 𐤀 (of), and not 𐤁 (to) which the sense requires. Unless it is a mistake, we may render 'Epistle which *is* Thessalonians.'

Thesalonikajê (as above *Kolosaijê*) with single *s*, for the Syrians did not usually double a letter, except in *Harcl.*, where the Greek is imitated. The vowel after the *n* is doubtful; 𐤀 being omitted here and below. We write *ns* with *Pesh.* 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀; so 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 in *Harcl.*

i. 1. congregation] 𐤀𐤀𐤀 *Hier.* in form, and the term is specially (though not exclusively) applied to the *Synagogue*. *Pesh.* and *Harcl.* have here the Christian term 𐤀𐤀 *Church*. The use of the former term seems to be connected with the Judæo-Christian origin of these fragments.

l. 8. 𐤀𐤀 *Hier.* suffix, as *Mat. vi. 9*, etc.

Our text recognises the $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega$, $\kappa. \tau. \lambda.$, which the Editors omit with cod. B, see *Sanday* 160.

2. ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ in the sense of *gratias agere* appears to be *Hier.*, see *Thes. Syr.* 1553.

ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ *Chald.*; also in *Hier.* (*Thes. Syr.* s. v.), but there commonly ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ , cf. *Rabb.* אדינא . Our form is clearly marked with *ribbut*¹ in several places—e. g. Plate II, col. 2, l. 13.

ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ] The MS. certainly has the (\circ), which, if not a mistake, must be a kind of stop. ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ in sense of *time* is *Hier.*

50] MS. apparently ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ , and we take the tense as *pres. perf.*, 'we have made.' On the idiomatic ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ , see Col. iv. 18 *sup.*

ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ *Hier.*; but there spelt ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ . The text recognises the ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ , which *WH* reject.

prayers] We add *ribbut*, which the sense seems to require, though illegible in the MS. On the use of the plural sign, see note, p. x1.

3. ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ] If this is to be referred, as in our translation, to *Ethp.*, the ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ is absorbed, *Hier.* more, cf. *Thes. Syr.* 898; but it may be *Aph.*, and then, perhaps, in the sense of *commemorate*.

ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ , a point of connection between this fragment and Num. iv. 47.

51] *Thes. Syr.* 1171 gives *Hier.* ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ for *Syr.* ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ ; cf. above ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ *Hier.* for our ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ , also (2 Tim. i. 18 n.) ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ and ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ . The *Palest.* spelling is arbitrary.

iv. 3. ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ , with ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ in penultimate, a *Palest.* form; see Duval, *Gram. Syr.* p. 90, n. 3.

l. 3. ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ] is not quite distinct: in *Hier.* we have ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ as here in *Pesh.*

4. We restore (l. 4) ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ and (l. 6) ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ as the lacunae require. Both the longer ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ and the shorter ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ occur in *Hier.*

ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ] *Palest.*, the Heb. אדינא , the Syriac forms being ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ and ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ , see *Schaaf* 496.

5. ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ and ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ] Apparently *Palest.*; ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ (*passio*) is quoted in *Thes. Syr.* 1393 from Mar Ephr.; see also 2 Tim. ii. 3 n. and p. xxii. n. 1; ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ and ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ occur in *Hier.*, the root is not *Syr.*

ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ] *Hier.* and *Chald.*

ܐܕܝܢܐܝܢ in sense of Gentiles often in *Hier.*; cf. Talm. גו a heretic, *Levy* s. v.

6, l. 16. The restoration is almost certain, the translator connecting vv. 6 and 8 by the use of the same word, although the Greek is here πλεονεκτεῖν , but there ἀθετεῖν .

¹ To object to this term, because introduced from the Hebrew, seems pedantic. It is retained by the learned author of the *Traité de Grammaire Syriacque*.

l. 18, word 1. The last syllable is not distinct, but doubtless we must read the *Hier.* prep. ܠܗܝܠܐ (*Thes. Syr.* 451) as in ver. 13, where (see collotype) the form is certain.

ܠܗܝܠܐ...ܐܝܬܐ (ἐκδικος...πεπλ) from ܐܝܬܐ, with the meaning which the Hebrew root has in Is. i. 24, where *Pesh.* ܐܝܬܐ ܠܗܝܠܐ; cf. Gen. xxvii. 42 ap. Gesenium, *Thes.* 874. ܐܝܬܐ *Hier.* appears to be used as *Chald.* ܐܝܬܐ consolari, see *Thes. Syr.* 2338.

He, Our Lord] So literally, and certainly suggesting the δ before Κύριος, which *WH* omit. The pronoun may even be used, *Harcl.* more, as a rendering of δ.

l. 22. The first word is doubtful. If we could read ܐܝܬܐ (ܐܝܬܐ perficere) the two verbs might be a free rendering of the ποιεῖν—we have finished all we have to say. The word however seems to be from ܐܝܬܐ, *Palest.* for ܐܝܬܐ, to express πρό. See further note on p. xl.

ܐܝܬܐ] *Hier.* for ܐܝܬܐ.

ܐܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܐ a *Heb.*, but not apparently a *Syr.* root. This particular form is not in Buxtorf, and is probably *Palest.*

8. ܐܝܬܐ] The reading is certain, but is probably a mistake for ܐܝܬܐ ille (*Thes. Syr.* 960), and so we have rendered it.

ܐܝܬܐ] *Hier.*; the Greek οὗ.

ܐܝܬܐ] Not as ver. 11, but *injure, afflict*, perhaps *contemn*, like ܐܝܬܐ II in *Heb.*, and cf. ܐܝܬܐ *ascetic*. In *Hier.*, ܐܝܬܐ gentle *Mat.* xi. 29, but xv. 24 answered, as ܐܝܬܐ I.

9. ܐܝܬܐ cf. *Col.* iv. 12; here and ver. 13 *conjunctim*.

ܐܝܬܐ] See i. 1, where it is written ܐܝܬܐ.

ܐܝܬܐ (and ver. 10)] *Hier.* pl. emph., see *Thes. Syr.* 1111.

ܐܝܬܐ] The restoration can hardly be doubtful; cf. *Pesh.* ܐܝܬܐ.

ll. 20, 21 are very obscure, especially the latter. The reading seems to be ܐܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܐ, and not the ܐܝܬܐ of *Pesh.*

10. ܐܝܬܐ] *Hier.*, as ܐܝܬܐ=ܐܝܬܐ, *Thes. Syr.* 960. ܐܝܬܐ *Hier.*; the Greek μάλλον.

ܐܝܬܐ] The reading appears to be certain (see the collotype). The translator separated φιλοτιμείσθαι from ἡσυχάζειν, inverted *περι.* and *φιλ.*, and rendered the latter by the *Peal* of ܐܝܬܐ. The usual meaning of ܐܝܬܐ (in the *Paal* laudare) is not unsuitable: *Peal* (though there does not seem to be an instance in *Pesh.* or the *Hexaplar*) may here be used in the similar sense (*Palest.* perhaps) of *giving honour*. We have also the *Rabb.* ܐܝܬܐ incrementum (*Buxt.* 2309, *Levy* ii. 447) and the verb in the text may be connected with this as though *φιλ.* were a synonym for *περι.*—in either case a poor translation. See also p. xli.

12. ܐܝܬܐ] In the sense of the *Heb.* חסיד; cf. *Chald.* חסידותא *Levy* i. 272. ܐܝܬܐ for *καγαριτωμένη* occurs in *Harcl.* and *Hier.* (*Luc.* i. 28), cf. ܐܝܬܐ p. 11, l. 5; but in *Hier.* the root appears to have elsewhere the other sense of *irridere*.

ܡܠܚܡ *Hier.*; for other spelling, see *Thes. Syr.* 1738.

ܡܠܚܡ is rather *Chald.* and *Rabb.* than *Syr.* Castell (*Lex. Syr.* p. 769) only quotes Acts iv. 34 and ܡܠܚܡ Prov. xxiv. 34.

THE RUBRIC. ܡܠܚܡ] 'Valde vicina reliquorum Syrorum,' Land, *Anecd. Syr.* iv. p. 204.

ܡܠܚܡ] See John iv. 54 *Hier.* 'Valde vicina ܡܠܚܡ,' Miniscalchi Erizzo.

In the second line, the form appears to be ܡܠܚܡ. '*Inclinationes* in Liturgia Missae sunt commemorationes pro vivis et defunctis secretae, ita dictae quia a sacerdote *inclinato* proferrentur,' Assemani in *Thes. Syr.* col. 664.

ܡܠܚܡ] Other forms are ܡܠܚܡ, Castell, Bernstein; *Rabb.* ܡܠܚܡ, Buxtorf 2091.

13. ܡܠܚܡ] With *ribbui*, on such forms superfluous, but no diacritical point. It must be taken as the passive, and a Palestinian contraction for ܡܠܚܡ. We have the *Hier.* ܡܠܚܡ for ἐτόλμα, John xxi. 12. The verb in *Pa.* means to comfort and encourage, see *Thes. Syr.* 1878, *Levy* i. 400; but as ܡܠܚܡ is sometimes used for *intellect*, perhaps we might render ܡܠܚܡ without knowledge, representing the ἀγνοεῖν.

1. 6. ܡܠܚܡ (see collotype) has here clearly *ribbui*; see further note on p. xl.

ܡܠܚܡ and ܡܠܚܡ] See collotype. In ܡܠܚܡ the second syllable is obscure; we read ܡܠܚܡ, the Talmudic ܡܠܚܡ (*Buxtorf* 2384). The word is marked with *ribbui*, a fem. (i.e. *neut.*) pl., 'the residue,' as though the translator had τὰ λοιπά. In *Hier.* Mat. xxvii. 49 Lagarde reads ܡܠܚܡ (οἱ λοιποί), but the MS. by a later hand has the *ribbui*.

In l. 7 ܡܠܚܡ *Palest.* is certainly to be read, as Mat. xxvi. 22; see note, p. xli.

2 TIMOTHY.

i. 10. ܡܠܚܡ *Palest.*, cf. Tit. ii. 7. It must have been preceded by ܡܠܚܡ for a *privative*, the translator mistaking ἀφθαρσίαν, or reading ἀφθαρτον. See further note on p. xli.

ܡܠܚܡ, l. 7 ܡܠܚܡ, l. 9 ܡܠܚܡ—all *Hier.* forms.

11. ܡܠܚܡ] and l. 11 ܡܠܚܡ] *Palest.*, ܡܠܚܡ as a *mater lectionis*, like the ܡ in ܡܠܚܡ 2 Tim. ii. 7.

ܡܠܚܡ, l. 12] One of the best examples in the fragments (see collotype) of the shape of the inverted *Pe*. Line 14 gives a clear instance of ܡ for (i) *unaspirated p*, ll. 1, 4 of ܡ for (ii) *aspirated p*, col. 2, l. 12, of ܡ for (iii) the Greek *Phi*. Although the ܡ in ܡܠܚܡ is equivalent to ܡ (i), yet it stands for π rather than ܡ, as the verb ܡܠܚܡ (Bar-Heb. ap. *Thes. Syr.* 3114) is borrowed from the aorist of πείθω. Cf. Duval, *Gram. Syr.* § 11, par. 3.

ܡܠܚܡ] *Hier.* It is clear (see collotype) that here no point was used to distinguish

the *part.* from the *pret.*; so apparently on p. 17, ll. 19, 21, 22, ܐܠ, ܠܐ, and ܠܐ'; but in none of these cases is the meaning ambiguous.

ܦܡܝܬ (and ver. 14) *Palest.* in the form and with the meaning of *Chald.* ܦܡܝܬ, *Heb.* ܦܡܝܬ.

13. ܦܡܝܬ] *Hier.* pl.; ܦܡܝܬ] cf. 1 Thess. iv. 19.

14. ܦܡܝܬ] *Palest.* form, for the usual passive sense is unsuitable. ܦܡܝܬ occurs in *Hier.* Luke xxiv. 18.

ܦܡܝܬ] Apparently *Palest.* In *Hier.* we have ܦܡܝܬ as in *Pesh.*; see *Thes. Syr.* s. v. ܦܡܝܬ.

15. At the end of l. 10 is a clear instance of the single stop which (*Introd.* p. viii) is of rare occurrence in our MSS. Another is perhaps found at the end of l. 4, p. 16.

l. 12. The MS. has ܦܡܝܬ, the figure between ܐ and ܐ showing two shades of colour, as though a continuation of the ܐ had been crossed by the upper writing. This distinction is almost lost in the photograph, and the figure appears in exaggerated blackness. I considered at first that there was an appendage to the ܐ, or a modification of the ܐ, intended to indicate the sound of ʔ in connection with the vowel which the translator read after it. We might compare the modifications of π and of Greek vowels, mentioned by *Duval*, § 25 b. But, in spite of the two colours, and the elongation of the last stroke, I am willing to concur in the suggestion of Mr. G. Margoliouth, that this stroke is part of a η at the end of the crossing line, the last word of which would then make with the first of the line following, the phrase ܦܡܝܬ ܢܒܠܐ. The word "ܦ" is rather cramped for want of space, but the final stroke of the last letter is extended. The phrase "ܢ" occurs in the middle of the line above. The form ܦܡܝܬ would stand for Phigilós, but the first vowel may perhaps represent the υ in ʔυγ. Land (*op. cit.* p. 214) quotes ܦܡܝܬ as occurring several times for φύσις in the *Fragmenta Theologica Petropolitana*. The Greek vowels were either confused by our translator (cf. Col. iv. 12) or represented inconsistently. In the next two names, he uses the same vowel letter (ܐ) for η. On λ or λλ, cf. note on 1 Thess. i. 1.

ܦܡܝܬ] The ܐ seems to represent 'Ερμωγένης, rather than 'Ερμ. On the forms of Phigelus and Hermogenes in the MSS., cf. *Tisch.* in loc.

ܦܡܝܬ] This form of the adjective is frequent in *Hier.*, see *Thes. Syr.* 128.

16. ܦܡܝܬ] With ܐ in the first syllable, *Palest.*

ܦܡܝܬ] With ܐܝܝܬ, and apparently always. Cf. Tit. ii. 2, l. 13 and note.


ܦܡܝܬ] We read ܐ; the point is faintly legible in the word written across. The form will be the *Aph.* of ܦܡܝܬ—*Ithpa.* ܦܡܝܬ refigeravit se, Buxtorf 2153.

17. ܦܡܝܬ] As in the subscription to Colossians. The form is usually ܦܡܝܬ

or **ῥώμη** (*Rṓmē*), see *Schaaf* s. v., and Bernstein's *Lexicon*, p. 471. Ours corresponds rather to *Roma*, and is perhaps a Latinism.

18 (also 16). **𐤁**] The *Heb.* form. *Hier.* (*Thes. Syr.* s.v.) has for the verb **𐤁𐤁**, but **𐤁** gives a noun, which Lagarde at Mark xv. 45 writes **𐤁𐤏𐤁**, but at Mat. vii. 11, in the plural, **𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏**.

l. 5. We had p. 17, l. 16; here the MS. appears to have *scriptio defectiva*.

l. 11. ] A clear instance (for here there is no upper writing) that the participle was not usually distinguished by a point; see note on l. 13, ver. 12.

:] This stop is here, and apparently in some other places, final, and not subordinate.

ii. i. **ח**] Cf. i Thess. iv. 11. Here **ח**; cf. **ח** above. *Script. pl.* is perhaps in place of *dagesh forte*, for Buxtorf (798) gives **ח**, but that word apparently always follows the other meaning *reproach*. **ח**, see p. 19, l. 10.

2. **מָכַר** in the sense of *tradere* is specially, though not exclusively, *Hier.*, and is the *Heb.* מָכַר.

[**مَدَّةٌ** **مَدَّةٌ**] In *Hier.* we have the common form **مَدَّةٌ**. Stoddard (in *Thes. Syr.* 235) gives the modern form **مَدَّةٌ**, which is like the *Palest.* form as read here and 1 Thess. iv. 14.

ⲙⲟⲩ] The *Hier.* ⲙⲟⲩ or ⲙⲟⲩ, cf. *Thes. Syr.* 840, *Miniscalchi Erizzo* s.v. It represents the reading *ikavol* rather than *duvarol*. ⲧⲉⲩⲉ *Palest.* form.

3. ܡܥܥ] The root in *Hier.*, as in ordinary Syriac, means *pati*; cf. ܡܥܥܥ (Col. iv. 13) a *Palest.* form, as it seems, for ܡܥܥܥܥ passio. ܡܥܥܥܥܥ (Thes. Syr. 1389) usually means *to be compassionate*, a meaning hardly suitable here. The three words are, no doubt, an attempt to render *συγκαταπαύσασθαι*, and show that the translator had that reading before him.

4, l. 8. In the sense of *involve oneself*, *Ethpe.* and *Ethpa.* are both used according to *Thes. Syr.* 1824-1825; the *Pe.* occurs in *Hier.*

l. 9. **حسب** *Mat. xxiii. 5 Hier. l. 10. [حسب]* Cf. *Chald.* ܚܝܝܠ *ille.*

1. 12. Palest. in form; Pesh. .

5. ܠܗ *Paest.*, representing the $\alpha\theta\lambda\omega$. *Chald.* ܠܗ (*Buxt.* 921) does not quite give the meaning; ܠܗ is doubtful, *Thes. Syr.* 1527, but *adj.* ܠܗ occurs with the meanings of *nobilis* and *strenuus*.

6. **ܐܘܪܝܢ** Hier. and Chald., *Thes. Syr.* 381, *Levy* i. 68.

ω] *oportet*, as Mat. xxv. 27, John iv. 24, *Hier.* In both places Lagarde also edits **ω**; emendation therefore (see *Thes. Syr.* 2416) seems unnecessary.

John i. 27 Lagarde edits **فعل**. 'A קדם, ad Hier. dialecti consuetudinem,' *Miniscalchi Erisso* s. v.

ܠܗܝܠ] *pl. emph. of the Hier. and Chald.* מִירָא.

7. ܝܠ in Syriac is *stupere*, *Cast.* 955; here the word has the meaning of the *Heb.* וַיַּר and represents the *וירא*.

ܠܗܝܠ] For the form compare ܠܗܝܠ 2 Tim. i. 11. There is no stop legible after this word; we supply one, otherwise the ܗ would depend on what precedes, as though the reading were *λέγω σοι*; but what the text was a *pr. m.* is uncertain.

TITUS.

i. 11, l. 1. ܠܗܝܠ, with *pron. suf.*, occurs in *Hier.*, see *Thes. Syr.* 882; it here represents the *χάρων*, and the preceding ܗܝܠ (*ék*) seems superfluous, but we have ܠܗܝܠ John iii. 3 *Hier.*—cf. the compounds in *Duval* 296; in line 11 ܠܗܝܠ is followed by a particle. ܗܝܠ might be the Greek *μέν, μήν*, as so often in *Harc.*, but there is nothing in the original to countenance this.

12. ܠܗܝܠ] Apparently *Palest.*; other forms, and the verbal root, occur in *Syr.* and *Chald.*

THE GLOSS. Although in smaller characters, this is written in a good and ancient hand, and is not necessarily later than the text. It ascribes the words to Epimenides alone, whereas in *Harc.* we read ܠܗܝܠ ܐܝܡܝܢܝܕܝܬ ܐܝܡܝܢܝܕܝܬ ܐܝܡܝܢܝܕܝܬ ܐܝܡܝܢܝܕܝܬ, a divination of Epimenides the Cretan diviner, and of Callimachus the Cyrenian.

ܠܗܝܠ] With *mat. lect.*, like ܠܗܝܠ, etc.; see 2 Tim. ii. 1 n.

ܠܗܝܠ] *Palest.*, cf. the *Chald.* ܠܗܝܠ; the Syrians spell with ܝ, as in the *Harclean* gloss.

l. 6. ܠܗܝܠ] If the reading be certain, it is a mistake for ܠܗܝܠ. ܠܗܝܠ *semper* is frequent in *Hier.*, cf. *Thes. Syr.* 2800.

ܠܗܝܠ] A *Palest.* plural form, the (••), which we have supplied, being illegible; or it is the singular, used as a collective.

13. ܠܗܝܠ] The *Chald.* ܠܗܝܠ, so (ver. 14) ܠܗܝܠ = ܠܗܝܠ; cf. *Heb.* ܠܗܝܠ, parallel with ܠܗܝܠ Prov. xxii. 21. In *Syr.* the ܠ is changed to ܠ, and the usual form is ܠܗܝܠ.

ܠܗܝܠ] See note on ver. 11 and Num. v. 3.

ܠܗܝܠ] The restoration can hardly be doubtful. The adverb occurs at 1 Cor. xv. 52 *Pesh.* as a translation of *ἐν ἀτόμῳ*. Perhaps the translator intended something similar here—*reprove in a moment, eagerly*; either mistaking the *ἀποτόμους*, or having another reading.

14. ܠܗܝܠ] The reading appears certain; the form must be *part. pass.* (but in a *middle* sense) of *Pael* or *Aphel*. In the latter, and in *Peal*, the word often occurs

as *injacere*. Bernstein (*Lexicon*, p. 486) cites from Assemani ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ *part. Peil* 'de fluminibus quae se injiciunt.' It is a strong rendering of *προσέχοντες*. *Pesh.* has *Ethpe.* ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ ܐܝܢܐ, 'et ne adjiciant se,' but *var. lect.* ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ, 'attendant'; see Schaaf *Lex.* pp. 118, 551.

l. 22. *Pesh.* has the curious reading ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ, *who hate* the truth. In our text the last part of the word ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ is illegible, but the third letter is almost certainly ܐ, and not ܐܝܢܐ, which the *Pesh.* reading requires; therefore we restore ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ. *Aph.* often has the meaning *avertere*, *Thes. Syr.* 1038; our form may be a *pass.*, or *intrans.* participle, representing the *ἀποστρεφόμενον*. In *Hier.* (Mat. xvii. 17, Luke ix. 41) we have ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ for *διεστραμμένη*—in the former place Lagarde points ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ.

15. ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ (ll. 4, 9) a *pass. part.*, cf. Num. v. 3.

l. 5. Here apparently with ܐ in the second syllable, cf. 2 Tim. ii. 1.

l. 8. This seems to be *Palest.* for *Chald.* and *Syr.* ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ. There being only one letter between ܐ and ܐܝܢܐ, we read ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ, a contracted form; cf. ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ for ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ 2 Tim. ii. 2, ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ (ut vid.) 1 Thess. iv. 3, ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ Num. iv. 49, and ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ for ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ.

16. In the first word of l. 12, ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ, ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ, ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ are distinct, and there is room in the lacuna for ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ; we therefore read ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ, which in *Hier.* is usually *Peal*, but *Aphel* occurs in John i. 36. The translator misunderstood *εἰδέναι*, or had in his copy *ἰδέν* or *ἰδέσθαι*. Col. iv. 17 ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ stands for *βλέπε*.

l. 19. ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ in this sense *Palest.* and *Chald.*, cf. Luke xvi. 15 *Hier.*

l. 21. ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ *Hier.* The word is followed by a small lacuna, with a trace of an initial ܐ. We therefore read ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ as *Pesh.*

ii. 2. ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ] The reading seems certain. ܐ is *mat. lect.*; with ܐ (e. g. i. 13) the shorter form occurs. Cf. *fem.* ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ in *Hier.*, *Thes. Syr.* 986.

3. in like manner] Literally *so and thus*; the formula is *Hier.*, and ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ in the sense of *so*, is specially, though not exclusively, *Hier.*

l. 9. The adjective, in the sing., and with ܐ, clearly agrees with *raiment*. They read *leponpenei*.

ll. 11, 15. ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ, ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ] In each case with, as it seems, a *Palest. fem. pl.* termination. For inserted ܐ, cf. ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ (3rd pl. m.) l. 1 *sup.*, ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ (1st pl. suf.) p. 17, l. 6, ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ (and pl. fem. imperat.) ii. 2 n.; also ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ l. 16 *inf.*, ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ in *Aph. fut.*

l. 12. An obscure line. (i) ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ is required as the first word, (ii) the first and last two letters of the second word are legible, and we restore ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ in agreement with the reading, p. 23, l. 2—the Shaphel as in *Pesh.* Eshtaphal forms occur in *Hier.*

l. 13. The second word, in the present state of the MS., appears to terminate in a ܐ, but probably is not to be so read, for ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ is in the *sing.* The adjective ܐܬܝܢܐܝܐ has *ribbui*, as fol. 1 r 2, l. 15, etc., and perhaps was so pointed, by a fancy

ADDITIONAL NOTES.

The sign of the plural.

In the note on 1 Thess. i. 2 (p. xxxii) we remarked that the plural form ܐܢܝܢ seems regularly to have been written with *ribbui* in our fragments. Clear examples may be seen on Plate II, col. 2, l. 1, and especially l. 13. The same plate shows the plural form ܐܢܝܢ with (·) in col. 1, l. 18, and col. 2, l. 6, but the points are not legible in col. 1, l. 13, or col. 2, l. 3. Again, such distinctly plural forms as ܩܕܝܫܝܢ and ܡܪܝܬܝܢ may be seen in the middle of the plate with the (·), while other examples abound in the fragments. We may conclude that it was the custom to make a free, and often superfluous, use of these points; which is the more remarkable because, as we have seen (e. g. 2 Tim. i. 18, p. xxxvi), the diacritical point, which is frequently desirable to distinguish the participle from the preterite, was usually neglected by the scribe.

If we compare Plate XVIII of the *Brit. Mus. Cat. of Syr. MSS.* with the transcript in *Lagarde* (p. 311) of the same passage (Mat. xxvi. 56-64) we see this custom with respect to the plurals prevailing both in the older leaf and in the eleventh-century Roman MS. On the other hand the later *Brit. Mus.* texts do not exhibit such a free use of the *ribbui*, according to the facsimiles on Plates XIX and XX; the former being from a MS. which Wright assigned to the tenth or eleventh century, the latter from a codex at least a century younger.

ܡܠܚܝܩ 1 Thess. iv. 6.

This word will strike the reader as the most curious in our text; but when we have acquired a wider knowledge of the Palestinian dialect than the remains, which are now available, afford, it may be found that many words, borrowed from the Arabic and elsewhere, were in common use for the most ordinary expressions. To confirm my own conclusion about the reading, I asked Professor D. S. Margoliouth to make an independent examination of the place, which he very kindly did, and has written to me as follows:—

'I have strained a good deal over the Syriac word, and think ܡܠܚܝܩ the right reading of it. I presume the natural Syriac for *προειπάμεν* would be ܡܠܚܝܩ ܡܠܚܝܩ; now it certainly is the case that in Arabic the verb سلف means something very like ܡܠܚܝܩ; the Arabic lexicons give تقدم as its equivalent. "Payment in advance" in Arabic is سلفاً الدفع. The verb in the second form (Pa"ēl) means "to send before," praemittere. If therefore the reading of the radical letters ܡܠܚܝܩ be right, it is difficult to avoid the conjecture that this is a dialectic variety for ܡܠܚܝܩ.'

Dr. Payne Smith, taking the same view, writes :—

'The Arabic سلف is to anticipate in time, prevent. But it seems strange that the translator should have gone out of his way when so common a phrase as *هو من قبل* was at his hand. Modern Syriac, which often goes to the Arabic, gives us no help, as *ܡܠܟܐ* is to dislocate a joint, evidently a sense taken from *ܡܠܟܐ* to draw out (a sword), but also a joint.'

According to Miniscalchi Erizzo, *ܡܠܟܐ* only occurs in *Hier.* once (John xviii. 10) and is used in the sense of *extrahere*.

ܡܠܟܐ (Plate II, col. 1, l. 6) 1 *Thess. iv.* 10.

Although the reading of the text of our MS. can hardly be anything but the *pres. part.*, it is possible that the original reading was *ܡܠܟܐ*. The omission of a *ܐ*, in a word of this form, is an error from which even the most careful scribe is not always exempt. The Syriac would then exactly represent *τιμεισθαι*, either because the translator had that word in his Greek, or because he misunderstood *φιλοτιμεισθαι*; and *ܡܠܟܐ* would not be unsuitable to the context—that ye be held in abundant honour (through your integrity) being peaceable and laborious.

ܡܠܟܐ (Plate II, col. 2, l. 7) 1 *Thess. iv.* 13.

The form is not distinct, the second syllable being suggestive of *ܡܠܟܐ*, and *ܡܠܟܐ* occurs in *Pesh.*, although here it has a different phrase, *ܡܠܟܐ*. But there can be no doubt that we must read the *Hier.* form, which we have adopted, the *Heb.* *מלך*. Several examples are cited in *Thes. Syr.* s. v.

ܡܠܟܐ (Plate III, col. 1, l. 1) 2 *Tim. i.* 10.

According to Dr. Land this form is a noun in *Theologica Petropolitana*, fr. 50. It occurs in the phrase *ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ*, and in the vocabulary in *Anecd. Syr.* iv. he writes 'inquisitio (?)'. But if we allow a possible error in the gender, it may be a verb (3rd fem. fut.) as it is in our text.

MS. fol. 3 r.

On the top of the page (see Plate III) is an obscure word, probably the heading *ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ* *Τιμεισθαι*.

MS. fol. 4 v.

On the top of this page we find, in an early hand, the following form :—

×
× ܡܠܟܐ ×

i. e. 'Epistle.' This is a confirmation of the view we have taken (see p. xix) that our fragments belonged to a complete copy of St. Paul's Epistles, and not to a Service Book.

dering *the affairs* of
 their houses, good, in
 subjection to their
 husbands, that the
 word of God may
 not be blasphemed.
 And of those who
 are young men in
 like manner be be-
 seeching that they
 be prudent. On ac-
 count of everything
 moreover, present thy-
 self a type of good
 works, in doctrine
 which may not be
 corrupted, which is in
 faith in the sure word
 which is not despised;
 in order that he
 who riseth in op-
 position [may be
 ashamed] when

MS. 4 v b

ወኃ [ገ] ርክረክረክ
 ቢታዘዝ
 [ገረ] ርክረክ
 ለእግዚአብሔር
 ምስጋና ይላሉ 5
 ለእግዚአብሔር
 ምስጋና ይላሉ ver. 6
 ለእግዚአብሔር
 ምስጋና ይላሉ
 [ገ] ርክረክ
 ምስጋና ይላሉ ver. 7
 ለእግዚአብሔር
 ምስጋና ይላሉ 11
 ለእግዚአብሔር
 ምስጋና ይላሉ
 ለእግዚአብሔር
 ምስጋና ይላሉ 15
 ለእግዚአብሔር
 ምስጋና ይላሉ ver. 8
 ለእግዚአብሔር
 ምስጋና ይላሉ
 ለእግዚአብሔር
 ምስጋና ይላሉ 20
 ለእግዚአብሔር
 ምስጋና ይላሉ
 ለእግዚአብሔር

let them be gentle,
wise, firm in faith,
in love, in patience.

The aged women in
like manner let them
be in raiment which
becometh godliness.

Not calumniators, not
devoted to much
wine. But let them
be good teachers, that
they make the young
women prudent, that
they be loving to
their husbands, that
they be loving to
their children, prudent,
holy, and may be or-

ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܝܬܝܢ

ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܬܝܬܝܢ

ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܬܝܬܝܢ

ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܬܝܬܝܢ

ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܬܝܬܝܢ 5

ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ver. 3

ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܬܝܬܝܢ

ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܬܝܬܝܢ

ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܬܝܬܝܢ

ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܬܝܬܝܢ 10

ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܬܝܬܝܢ

ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܬܝܬܝܢ

ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܬܝܬܝܢ

ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܬܝܬܝܢ

ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܬܝܬܝܢ 15

ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ver. 4

ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܬܝܬܝܢ

ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܬܝܬܝܢ

ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܬܝܬܝܢ

ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܬܝܬܝܢ 20

ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ver. 5

ܠܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܬܝܬܝܢ

the truth. Everything
 is pure to the pure;
 but to those who *are*
 defiled and do not
 believe there is no-
 thing whatever pure,
 but also their mind *is*
 defiled and their con-
 science; and *they are*
 professing that they
 are seeing God, and
 in their works they
 are denying Him, and
are hateful, and not
 obedient, and to every
 good work reprobate.
 But do thou speak
 that which becometh
 the sound doctrine.
 Their aged men

MS. 4 r b
 ver. 15
 5
 10
 ver. 16
 15
 ii. 1
 20
 ver. 2

on account of polluted gain. Saith one, he a prophet of them, that the sons of K'rīṭa *are* in all their time liars, evil beasts, idle bellies. This witness is true, therefore sharply be reproving them, that they may be firm in the faith, and may not be throwing themselves away unto words of the Jews, and unto commandments of the sons of men, who turn away from

[illegible]

may teach others.
 Bear up against evil,
 as the good warrior
 of Jesus the Christ.
 No man who warreth,
 warreth and involveth
 himself in the business
 of the world: that he
 may please him who
 enrolled him; and if
 a man strive he is not
 crowned except law-
 fully he do strive.
 The husbandman who
 laboureth, it behoves
 that he first of the
 fruits should be eat-
 ing. Consider that
 which I myself
 have said; to thee

MS. 3 v b

ܠܡܥܢܐ ܬܥܠܡܐ
 ܠܡܥܢܐ ܬܥܠܡܐ ver. 3

ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ
 ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ

ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ 5

ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ ܠܡܥܢܐ ver. 4

ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ
 ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ
 ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ

ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ : ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ 10

ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ

ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ : ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ ver. 5

ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ
 ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ
 ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ

ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ 15

ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ

ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ ver. 6

ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ

ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ

ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ 20

ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ ver. 7

ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ : ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ

to Roma, he sought me diligently and found me. May the Lord grant him that he may find mercy with Him in that day; and every way that he ministered to me at Ephesus thou knowest well. Thou therefore, my son, be strong in the grace, that which is in our Lord Jesus the Christ; and those things which thou hast heard from me, by the hand of many witnesses, these deliver to faithful men, those who shall be fit; that they also

ཀུན་ཀྱི་ཀྱེ་ཀྱེ་
 ཀྱི་ཀྱེ་ཀྱེ་
 ཀྱི་ཀྱེ་ཀྱེ་
 ཀྱི་ཀྱེ་ཀྱེ་ ver. 18
 ཀྱི་ཀྱེ་ཀྱེ་ 5
 ཀྱི་ཀྱེ་ཀྱེ་
 ཀྱི་ཀྱེ་ཀྱེ་
 ཀྱི་ཀྱེ་ཀྱེ་
 ཀྱི་ཀྱེ་ཀྱེ་
 ཀྱི་ཀྱེ་ཀྱེ་ 10
 ཀྱི་ཀྱེ་ཀྱེ་ ii. 1
 ཀྱི་ཀྱེ་ཀྱེ་
 ཀྱི་ཀྱེ་ཀྱེ་
 ཀྱི་ཀྱེ་ཀྱེ་
 ཀྱི་ཀྱེ་ཀྱེ་ 15
 ཀྱི་ཀྱེ་ཀྱེ་ ver. 2
 ཀྱི་ཀྱེ་ཀྱེ་
 ཀྱི་ཀྱེ་ཀྱེ་
 ཀྱི་ཀྱེ་ཀྱེ་
 ཀྱི་ཀྱེ་ཀྱེ་ 20
 ཀྱི་ཀྱེ་ཀྱེ་
 ཀྱི་ཀྱེ་ཀྱེ་

the Christ. The good
deposit keep in the
Holy Spirit, this One
who dwelleth in the
midst of us. Thou
knowest this, that
there have turned
themselves from me
all those who *are* in
Asia; of whom one
is Phigilos and the
other Hermôgenis.
May the Lord grant
mercies to the house
of Ontsēphoros, for
many times he re-
freshed my Spirit,
and of my chain he
was not ashamed;
but when he came

[II. 5.]

C

MS. 3 r b

.Kuuu
 Kuf Kuaua ver. 14
 Kuaua if
 :Kuaa
 Kuuu Kuaua 5
 Kuaua .Kuaa ver. 15
 Kuaua Kuaua
 Kuaua Kuaua
 Kuaua Kuaua 10
 Kuaua Kuaua
 :Kuaua
 Kuaua
 :Kuaua
 Kuaua ver. 16
 Kuaua Kuaua 16
 .Kuaua Kuaua
 Kuaua Kuaua
 Kuaua Kuaua
 Kuaua Kuaua 20
 :Kuaua
 Kuaua Kuaua ver. 17

be abolished, in the
gospel; that for which
I am appointed a
herald and an apos-
tle, and a teacher.
For the sake of this
cause, I also endure
these things, but I am
not ashamed; for I
know in whom I have
believed, and I am
persuaded that He
is able to keep my
deposit to that day.
Let there be with
thee the pattern
of the sound words,
those which thou
hast heard from me
in faith and in love
which is in Jesus

നവരൂപം ദൈവം

മഹത്തരം വാഗ്ദത്തം ver. 11

10-11 ന്ന

മഹത്തരം വാഗ്ദത്തം

നവരൂപം വാഗ്ദത്തം ver. 12

കുറവു വാഗ്ദത്തം 6

മഹത്തരം വാഗ്ദത്തം

കുറവു : വാഗ്ദത്തം

മഹത്തരം വാഗ്ദത്തം

11-12 ന്ന 10

: മഹത്തരം വാഗ്ദത്തം

മഹത്തരം വാഗ്ദത്തം

12-13 ന്ന

മഹത്തരം വാഗ്ദത്തം

14-15 ന്ന 15

16-17 ന്ന ver. 13

കുറവു വാഗ്ദത്തം

കുറവു വാഗ്ദത്തം

കുറവു വാഗ്ദത്തം

കുറവു വാഗ്ദത്തം 20

കുറവു വാഗ്ദത്തം

കുറവു വാഗ്ദത്തം

കുറവു വാഗ്ദത്തം

to all the brethren
who *are* in Makedo-
nia. But we beseech
of you, brethren, that
ye be the more increas-
ing [*? giving honour*]
and abounding, and
that ye be quiet and
occupied in your occu-
pations, and that ye be
labouring with your
hands, according to all
which we commanded
you; that ye be walk-
ing piously towards
those who are without,
and that of man ye be
not at all in need.

Lesson the second;
Kephalton of Inclination:

ܠܠܗܡ ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ
 ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ.
 ܠܠܗܡ ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ
 ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ 5
 ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ
 ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ ver. 11
 ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ
 ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ
 ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ 10
 ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ
 ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ
 ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ ver. 12
 ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ
 ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ 15
 ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ
 ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ
 ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ
 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3
 ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ
 ܕܡܬܝܬܝܢ 20
 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3

to you and testified.
 For God did not call
 you unto filthiness,
 but unto holiness.
 That one therefore,
 whosoever oppresseth,
 of man he is not an
 oppressor, but of God,
 who hath put his Holy
 Spirit within you.
 Concerning, however,
 love of the brethren,
 ye do not need that I
 should write to you.
 For ye yourselves
 are taught of God
 that ye should love
 one another. For be-
 hold ye are doing it

MS. 2 rb

୧. ଶୁଦ୍ଧିତ ହେବା
 ନିମନ୍ତେ ଶୁଦ୍ଧି
 କଲେଣି ଶୁଦ୍ଧି
 କଲେଣି ଶୁଦ୍ଧି
 ଶୁଦ୍ଧି କଲେଣି ୫
 ମୋ ଶୁଦ୍ଧି କଲେଣି ୮
 ଶୁଦ୍ଧି କଲେଣି
 ଶୁଦ୍ଧି କଲେଣି
 ଶୁଦ୍ଧି କଲେଣି ୧୦
 ଶୁଦ୍ଧି କଲେଣି
 ଶୁଦ୍ଧି : ଶୁଦ୍ଧି ୧୨
 ଶୁଦ୍ଧି କଲେଣି
 ଶୁଦ୍ଧି କଲେଣି
 ଶୁଦ୍ଧି କଲେଣି ୧୫
 ଶୁଦ୍ଧି କଲେଣି
 ଶୁଦ୍ଧି କଲେଣି
 ଶୁଦ୍ଧି କଲେଣି
 ଶୁଦ୍ଧି କଲେଣି ୨୦
 ଶୁଦ୍ଧି କଲେଣି ୨୨
 ଶୁଦ୍ଧି କଲେଣି

ਮਹਾ ਅਰਜ

୧୫ କର[ମ]ଣ ver. 4

5. האם אתם חושבים שיש

கூ [க]த

ಮಹಾ ನದಿ

حکم و حکمت:

משפט קאני ver. 5

קראתך יי

කළාස යන

ادھتقہ ملہ

الحکومت

דאָס בוך ver. 6

15

מכתב א[בנ]א

لکھنؤ، ۱۵ مارچ

לחלוקה

ନିମ୍ନ

۱۰. **بہارِ حلالہ**

കുടുംബം

تخلیف کا حکم

to the congregation
of the Thesalonikaijē
in God the Father,
and in our Lord Jesus
the Christ. Grace
be with you and
peace, from God,
our Father, and from
our Lord Jesus the
Christ. We give
thanks to God, at
every time, for the
sake of you all; and
we have made the
memorials of you,
in our prayers; with-
out ceasing remem-
bering the work of
your faith, and the
labour of [your] love

MS. 1 v b

ܐܠܠܗܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܬܝܠܕܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ 5
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ 10
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ver. 2
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ 15
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ver. 3
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ 20
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 [ܕܡܪܝܢ] ܕܡܪܝܢ

Remember ye them,
even my bonds.
May grace be with
you.

අනුමත
අනුමත
: : : : :
: : : : :
: : : : : 5

Ended is the Epistle
which is to the Kōlōsaijē.
Now it was written from
Roma, and was sent
with Tīcikos, and with
[On]tīsimos.

අනුමත
අනුමත
: : : : :
: : : : :
: : : : : 11

Epistle of the Thesalō-
nikaijē, The First.

අනුමත
: : : : :
: : : : :

Paulos and Silvanos
and Tīmōtheōs

අනුමත i. 1
අනුමත 15
අනුමත

lute the brethren,
those who *are* in
Ladikija, and Num-
phas, and also the
Church which *is* in
her house. And
when there shall be
read before you this
epistle, cause that
also in the Church
of Ladikija it be
read: also do ye
read this one which
is in Ladikija. And
say also to Archippos,
Look to the minis-
try, this which thou
didst receive in the
Lord, that thou fulfil
it. The salutation
by my hand, of
me Paulos myself.

[II. 5.]

ܐܡܢ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ
 ܕܠܕܝܩܝܝܐ ܕܢܘܡܦܝܐ ܕܥܝܬܐ
 ܕܠܕܝܩܝܝܐ ܕܢܘܡܦܝܐ ܕܥܝܬܐ
 ܕܠܕܝܩܝܝܐ ܕܢܘܡܦܝܐ ܕܥܝܬܐ 5
 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ
 ܕܠܕܝܩܝܝܐ ܕܢܘܡܦܝܐ ܕܥܝܬܐ
 ܕܠܕܝܩܝܝܐ ܕܢܘܡܦܝܐ ܕܥܝܬܐ
 ܕܠܕܝܩܝܝܐ ܕܢܘܡܦܝܐ ܕܥܝܬܐ 10
 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ
 ܕܠܕܝܩܝܝܐ ܕܢܘܡܦܝܐ ܕܥܝܬܐ
 ܕܠܕܝܩܝܝܐ ܕܢܘܡܦܝܐ ܕܥܝܬܐ 14
 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ
 ܕܠܕܝܩܝܝܐ ܕܢܘܡܦܝܐ ܕܥܝܬܐ
 ܕܠܕܝܩܝܝܐ ܕܢܘܡܦܝܐ ܕܥܝܬܐ
 ܕܠܕܝܩܝܝܐ ܕܢܘܡܦܝܐ ܕܥܝܬܐ 18
 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ
 ܕܠܕܝܩܝܝܐ ܕܢܘܡܦܝܐ ܕܥܝܬܐ 21
 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ

B

[shall do] any offence
of the sons of men,
and who a transgres-
sion shall transgress,
and the soul shall it-
self sin; let him recount
the offence which he
did, and let him pay
the sin which is upon
him, and let him add
unto it one of five,
and let him pay to
him against whom he
sinned. If, however,
the man have not him
who is near to him, so
that he may pay the sin,

[חבד] חסד חסד [לחם] ver. 6

והחטא

אדחבד חסד

אדחבד חסד 4

אדחבד חסד ver. 7

אדחבד חסד

אדחבד חסד

אדחבד חסד

אדחבד חסד

אדחבד חסד 10

אדחבד חסד :

אדחבד חסד ver. 8

אדחבד חסד

אדחבד חסד

אדחבד חסד 15

the camp, and let
 them not defile your
 camps, those in which
 I am. And thus did the
 sons of Israil; and sent
 them away out from
 the camp; according
 to that which the Lord
 commanded Moshê, so
 did the sons of Israil.

ver. 3

וַיִּשְׁלַח ה' אֶת-מֹשֶׁה
 וְאֶת-אַהֲרֹן בְּעַד הַכֹּהֲנִים
 וְהַלְוִיִּם הַנִּזְכָּרִים
 מִן-הַכֹּהֲנִים וְהַלְוִיִּם
 5 וַיִּשְׁלַח ה' אֶת-מֹשֶׁה
 וְאֶת-אַהֲרֹן בְּעַד הַכֹּהֲנִים
 וְהַלְוִיִּם הַנִּזְכָּרִים
 מִן-הַכֹּהֲנִים וְהַלְוִיִּם
 10 וַיִּשְׁלַח ה' אֶת-מֹשֶׁה
 וְאֶת-אַהֲרֹן בְּעַד הַכֹּהֲנִים
 וְהַלְוִיִּם הַנִּזְכָּרִים
 מִן-הַכֹּהֲנִים וְהַלְוִיִּם
 15 וַיִּשְׁלַח ה' אֶת-מֹשֶׁה
 וְאֶת-אַהֲרֹן בְּעַד הַכֹּהֲנִים
 וְהַלְוִיִּם הַנִּזְכָּרִים
 מִן-הַכֹּהֲנִים וְהַלְוִיִּם

ver. 4

10

.

.

* * * *

* * * * ver. 49

them, by the hand of
 Moshê; man *by* man
 for his works, and for
 those things which
 they bear. And they
 were numbered ac-
 cording to that which
 the Lord commanded
 Moshê.

מֹשֶׁה וְכָל
 בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
 לְכָל עֲלֵמָם
 וְכָל מִלְּכָם
 וְכָל מִלְּכָם
 וְכָל מִלְּכָם
 וְכָל מִלְּכָם
 וְכָל מִלְּכָם

And the Lord spake
 with Moshê and *was*
 saying: Command the
 sons of Israël, and let
 them send away out

וְכָל מִלְּכָם
 וְכָל מִלְּכָם
 וְכָל מִלְּכָם
 וְכָל מִלְּכָם
 וְכָל מִלְּכָם
 וְכָל מִלְּכָם
 וְכָל מִלְּכָם

Cap. v

11

ver. 2

[Moshe and Aharon]
and the Princes
of Israil [numbered]
the Livijē in their
multitudes according
to the house of their
fathers, from a son
of twenty and five
years and upwards,
unto a son of fifty
years; every one who
entereth unto the
works of the services;
and the services
which were borne
in the Tabernacle

[אִמְרָא קְרָא]

קְרָא

לְמִשְׁכָּנִי

לְמִשְׁכָּנִי

לְמִשְׁכָּנִי 5

לְמִשְׁכָּנִי

מִן בֶּן עֶשְׂרִים וְחָמֵשׁ ver. 47

וְעַד בֶּן חֲמִשִּׁים

וְעַד בֶּן חֲמִשִּׁים

לְכָל אִישׁ מִשְׁכָּנִי 10

עֲתָם בְּעֹלֵי הַמִּשְׁכָּן

לְעֹלֵי הַמִּשְׁכָּן

וְעַל הַמִּשְׁכָּן וְעַל הַמִּשְׁכָּן

וְעַל הַמִּשְׁכָּן

וְעַל הַמִּשְׁכָּן 15

CONTENTS

OF

THE FIVE FRAGMENTS



I	PAGES
<i>Numbers</i> IV. 46, 47; IV. 49—V. 2; V. 3, 4; V. 6-8	4-7
II.	
<i>Colossians</i> IV. 12-18; 1 <i>Thessalonians</i> I. 1-3	8-11
III.	
1 <i>Thessalonians</i> IV. 3-15	12-15
IV.	
2 <i>Timothy</i> I. 10—II. 7	16-19
V.	
<i>Titus</i> I. 11—II. 8	20-23

[MS. Syr. c. 4 Bibl. Bodl.]

Oxford

PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

BY MORACE HART, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY



VERSIO PALAESTINENSIS

SEU

HIEROSOLYMITANA

FIVE PALIMPSEST LEAVES

BEING FRAGMENTS OF

Two very Ancient Manuscripts

THE SYRIAC TEXT

WITH

AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION

AND

THREE FACSIMILES

Oxford

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1893



